
The adnominal adjective in Attic and Modern Greek.

Exam No. 7429547

Thesis submitted for the degree of
Master of Science in Applied Linguistics.

To

The Department of Linguistics and English Language,
School of Philosophy, Psychology and Language Sciences,
University of Edinburgh.

August 2010

To Trou-
for making this come true.

Abstract

The aim of the present study is to analyze the adnominal adjective in Attic and Modern Greek. In both languages the adjective can precede or follow the modified noun while a definite article can precede both the adjective and the noun. It is stated in literature that the adjective functions either as attributive or as predicative modifier. Using alternative terminology (by Huddleston and Pullum 2002) for all functions, firstly I propose that in Modern Greek there can be also one function, namely parathesis, which is assumed to be a function realized only by nouns. I also suggest for both languages that the predicative modifier is actually the same function as what is called predicative adjunct. A further aim of this project is to examine whether the variation in constructions found in both languages is just for emphasis, as suggested in the literature. It is argued that the presence and position of the definite article, the word order and the kind adjective (ascriptive/associative) are factors affecting the function and semantics of AdjP. It is also argued that the same constructions in these two languages are not equal: the default word order is different (Noun, Adjective for Attic Greek and Adjective, Noun for Modern Greek), while the less common constructions in both languages are used in different situations.

Acknowledgments

My sincere thanks go first and foremost to my supervisor and teacher, Geoffrey Pullum. His advice, support and dedication have greatly inspired me to “sink into this project” while I have gained valuable knowledge from all our meetings. Doubting even the most well-established concepts in my mind about syntax is something I owe entirely to my supervisor.

Two of the greatest teachers I have ever had, who were (un)consciously throughout this year a constant and strong motivation: Miriam Meyerhoff and my students.

I thank my parents, for they this year and always supported me the way I needed – thus, for their daring trust.

And of course, I want to thank my friends and classmates with whom I shared the precious intellectual environment of our department: Alice, Alexandra, Maria, Ruth, and Tammaki for all great moments we shared inside and outside the DSB. Valeria, for her emotional generosity, warmth and all positive energy (and Danilo for being the light in the everyday routine). Last but not least, I want to thank my friend Manuela for her moral support, for proofreading my essays and for sharing my desire for food, thought and syntax.

Ευχαριστώ από καρδιάς.

Table of contents

1. Introduction	1
2. Lexical categorization of the noun and the adjective	4
2.1 Nouns	5
2.2 Adjectives	8
2.3 Nouns vs Adjectives	10
2.4 Can adjectives turn into nouns?	12
3. Functions of the adnominal adjective	15
3.1 Adjectival modifier vs attributive modifier	16
3.1.1 Ascriptive adjectives	17
3.1.2 Associative adjectives	18
3.2 Predicative modifier	20
3.2.1 The term ‘adverbial predicative complement’	24
3.2.2 The function: predicative modifier vs predicative adjunct	25
3.2.3 Adjectives functioning as predicative adjunct	27
3.3 Parathesis	28
3.4 Epexegetis	29
3.5 Critique of the traditional categorization	29
4. Definiteness and indefiniteness in modified NPs	32
4.1 Attic Greek	32
4.1.1 Definiteness	32
4.1.2 Indefiniteness	32
4.2 Modern Greek	33
4.2.1 Definiteness	33
4.2.2 Indefiniteness	33
4.3 Possible positions of the definite article in AG and MG	34
4.3.1 Functions of the AdjP in each construction	34
4.4 Possible word order in AG and MG	36
5. Analysis of each construction in Attic and Modern Greek	37
5.1 Constructions in Attic Greek	37
5.1.1 AdjP as attributive modifier	38
5.1.2 AdjP as predicative adjunct	42
5.1.3 Coordination	43
5.2 Constructions in Modern Greek	43

5.2.1	AdjP as attributive modifier	43
5.2.2	AdjP as predicative adjunct	53
5.2.3	AdjP as parathesis	56
5.2.4	Multiple modification	57
5.3	Discussion	61
6.	Conclusions	63
	-References	65

Chapter 1

Introduction

Attic Greek and Modern Greek are the languages this project is focusing on for the analysis of adjectives. Attic Greek, a dead language, is a dialect of Ancient Greek used in Athens from 6th century B.C. and it is a branch of the Ionic dialect. Until the 6th century the need of a universal language for all Greece did not exist and different dialects were actually used. As Attic Greek was a prestigious one, Philipp B' (4th B.C.) established Attic Greek as the official language of Macedonia. That is why Attic Greek became the basis of *Alexandrine Koine* which was the dominant language after 3rd century B.C in Greece and in all places conquered by Phillip's son, Alexander the Great. The tragedies of Aeschylus, Sophocles, Euripides, the work of Plato and Aristotle as well as the history of Xenophon, Thucydides and some parts of Herodotus work are written in this dialect. Modern Greek is the standard language used currently in Greece.

Attic Greek and Modern Greek (henceforth AG and MG respectively) have many similarities; however, only treating them as two different languages will guide us to discover the actual similarities. This, of course, creates more problems to the accurate syntactic description of both languages. Except for the same terminology the description of these two languages shares the same definitions for all grammatical categories, the same functions etc. Actually examples used in syntax books for Ancient Greek are either made up by recent grammarians or they use actual examples from texts- however fixed and simplified in terms of what is more usual in Modern Greek. AG is analyzed in terms of MG while the analysis of MG is based on ancient grammarians. Moreover, the terminology used in Greek grammars for the description of AG and MG is based on a deep confusion between the notions of grammatical category and syntactic function.

All this confusion, vague and parallel analysis of AG and MG is not a fortuitous event. The phenomenon of diglossia arose in Greece after the 18th century when Greece became a nation and a national language was needed and it is still apparent today. The 'Greek language question' was actually a huge political controversy between people defending the purified language '*katharevousa*' against

the ones defending the language used by people, the Demotic language. *Katharevousa* was a cultivated imitation of Attic Greek; it was not a real language. The need for creating a strong national identity and to differentiate the Greeks from all other nations that conquered Greece was to link this new nation with its past. Even after the final establishment of Demotic language in Greece in 1977 the need for a strong link between Modern Greece and the glories of ancient history is also evident in the fact that AG is still an obligatory subject in high schools as an essential part of Greeks' education. Of course the problem is not that Ancient Greek is taught but the way it is analyzed and described so that it can be easily taught and of course the way it affects the analysis of MG. The textbooks used by all high school students and teachers (as they are published by the Ministry of Education) illustrate clearly this superficial and mixed analysis. Unsurprisingly, there is a general accepted belief amongst Greeks that AG and MG are the same language differentiated slightly as time went by.

This project focuses on the adnominal adjectival modification in Attic and Modern Greek. Both languages have a complex inflectional system which allows a relatively free word order in the clause but also in the NP structure. Interestingly, in both languages an adjective modifying a noun can be pre or post-nominal, while both can be preceded by a definite article. This resemblance still leads grammarians to analyze this phenomenon similarly for both languages. Nevertheless, we will argue that there are fundamental differences between AG and MG regarding these constructions. We will analyze them separately for each language, both syntactically and semantically, bringing into light both similarities and dissimilarities. It is an attempt to provide a thorough account of the meaningful existence of the numerous adnominal structures while highlighting syntactic and semantic evidence for the need of treating these two languages as different.

This analysis follows the terminology and syntactic analysis of *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language* (Huddleston and Pullum 2002) adapted as necessary to the phenomena of AG and MG.

The structure of this study

This dissertation is divided into six chapters. Chapter 2 starts with the traditional definitions of noun and adjective classes found in grammars for Attic and Modern

Greek, and argues that they should be redefined. Distinctive properties of noun and adjective are stated and then a comparative presentation of the properties is presented so that it can be used as criteria of distinguishing words belonging in these two lexical categories. In addition, the fused-head modifier function is suggested as an alternative to the concept on nominalization of adjectives in cases where the head of the NP is missing.

Chapter 3 presents an overview of the literature on the types of dependents of a NP in AG and MG focusing on the functions an adjective can have. In terms of the traditional categorization of NP dependents, each function is described with examples, redefined, while alternative terminology is suggested. The categorization of ascriptive and associative adjectives is used for the better explanation of the attributive and predicative function. Furthermore it is suggested that the adnominal adjective in MG can have more functions than already admitted. Finally, the traditional categorization of NP dependents is criticized and a new one is proposed.

Chapter 4 deals with the role of definiteness and indefiniteness of an NP that includes an AdjP. Firstly, it is described how definiteness and indefiniteness works in simple NPs in AG and MG. Secondly, on the basis of two factors, that is, the existence or absence of the definite article and the word order (pre or post nominal) the functions of the adnominal adjective are systematised. It is suggested that these two factors determine the syntactic function. All possible constructions found in both languages are analysed.

Chapter 5 discusses the use of each construction in Attic Greek and Modern Greek separately. For each language all constructions are described starting from the most common to the least common organised by the function the AdjP has. Observations on their use, their semantic interpretation and special features found are provided. Furthermore, the use of many modifiers in the NP is discussed. Finally, a brief comparison of the major differences found in the two languages with respect to these constructions is illustrated.

Finally, chapter 6 states the conclusions which can be drawn from this study as well as some suggestions for future research.

Chapter 2

Lexical categorization of the noun and the adjective

Ancient grammarians (Greek and Latin) used the term *onoma* ‘name, noun¹’ to refer both to what is generally accepted today as the grammatical category of the noun and the adjective. According to grammarians, what is now divided into two categories belonged together because they were both “naming” the entities of the world. The term *onoma* encompassed two subcategories which broadly match today’s definitions of noun and adjective. What today is called noun they called *ousiastiko* ‘substantive’ to denote that it is the “substantial noun” – the substantial name of things in the world. For what today is called adjective they used the term *epitheto*.

The term *epitheto* etymologically comes from the preposition *epi* which means ‘in addition’ and the verb *theto* which means ‘to put’. Thus, according to ancient grammarians an adjective was a noun (*onoma*) standing near the substantial name of things (*ousiastiko*) and could easily be left outside. Centuries later, Jespersen (1923: 81), while discussing this class differentiation concludes that “nouns have a more special signification whereas adjectives a more general one, as the former connote the possession of a complexity of qualities and the latter the possession of one single quality”.

Triantafyllides (1941), in his leading work *Neoeliniki Gramatikis tis Elinikis Dimotikis* (Modern Greek Grammar of Greek (Demotic)), used the latter categorization and Greek grammarians following his work still use the same terminology to describe both Attic Greek and Modern Greek. However, in some grammars the noun is called *onoma* while in others *ousiastiko*, with no particular explanation for the choice. This is also a sign for a deep confusion in Greek grammars in terms of lexical categorization: it seems that the terminology they use is sometimes an almost random decision not based on a differentiation between the two categories (i.e. even though they use one term over the other, the definition of the noun category is always the same). The term *epitheto* is the only term used in Greek grammars for the lexical category of adjectives. Only Cleris and Babinotis (2005) argue in favor of

¹ The etymology of the word goes back to the Latin word *nomen*, *-inis* which denoted the proper or the personal name.

the term *onoma* exclusively² for nouns and of the term *epitheto* for adjectives. They support their opinion by defining the noun (*onoma*) as ‘the reference to the world of reality’ which comes in sharp contrast to the adjective which is the specialization of this reference. Actually, they use the ancient grammarians’ explanation for the terms although they try to show a greater distinction between the two lexical categories of the noun and the adjective.

In this essay the terms *noun* and *adjective* will be used. As we can see the question of what is a noun and what is an adjective is by no means straight forward. Traditional grammars have not presented clear definitions of the terms, or when they do then confuse class with function and function with class. This chapter attempts to define these two categories for AG and MG. In cases where there are differences in the two languages, we will explain things separately.

2.1 Nouns

According to traditional grammars a noun is a word that refers to persons, animals, things, places and in notions that denote a property, an action or a situation. However, according to traditional grammars adjectives denote properties, while verbs denote actions, acts or situations (Cleris and Babiniotis 2005: 3). So, what is it that differentiates nouns from adjectives or verbs? Cleris and Babiniotis (2005: 3)³ add that “speakers use nouns for their communication in order to identify or refer to beings that are part of the world of reality”. There has to be a more solid and accurate definition for the grammatical category of nouns. Pullum (2009: 256) using Leonard Bloomfield’s example (1933: 266) about the “nounhood” of fire and other non-thing nouns like “failure”, “lack”, “emptiness” suggests that the test of a word’s being a noun is not of our intuition that it names a kind of thing, but the form it has. Thus, the criteria we introduce for the definition of nouns in AG and MG are based on morphological and syntactic facts, which is what Joseph and Philippaki-Warbuton (1987) do to a certain degree.

² However, randomly the term *ousiastiko* is used in their grammar (e.g. p. 6).

³ Here, as in any other quoted phrase from Cleris and Babiniotes (2005), translation is mine.

Distinctive properties of prototypical nouns:

a) **Inflection.** Nouns typically⁴ inflect for number (singular or plural) and case (nominative, genitive, accusative and vocative).

The inflectional system of nouns in Greek (AG and MG) is rather complex. In AG nouns are classified in three main inflectional groups in terms of their suffixes⁵ and their gender (Oikonomou 1961). Setting criteria for noun classification in MG is a contested issue among grammarians of the last fifty years. Triantafyllides (1941) first classified nouns based on gender and inflexional suffixes; this classification is also followed by, among others, Joseph and Philippaki-Warbuton (1987), Holton, Mackridge and Philippaki-Warbuton (1997), but they add some criteria for subcategorizations. Kourmoulis (1965) introduced another criterion; he classified nouns in two groups: the ones that have two morphologically different cases and the ones that have three morphologically different cases; Babiniotis and Kondos (1967) and Cleris and Babiniotis (2005) apply Kourmoulis' suggestion. Generally there is no actual consensus regarding this matter, and other views different from the abovementioned exist.

b) **Gender.** Nouns assign for grammatical gender (masculine, feminine or neuter)

c) **Function.** Nouns can normally fill the head position in a phrase with any of these functions:

[1]

i) In clause structure:

SUBJECT	<i>O <u>papaghalos</u> htipai ton kathighiti.</i>	MG
	The parrot hits the professor.	
	<i>I <u>areti</u> ipo panton anthropon ziloute.</i>	AG
	Virtue is envied by all people.	
OBJECT	<i>Emis pezoume <u>piano</u>.</i>	MG
	We play the piano.	
	<i>Athinei epethimoun tis <u>irinis</u>.</i>	AG

⁴There are though some exceptions; there are some non inflected nouns in MG which are loan words that are not incorporated in the Greek inflectional system (especially from English and French). Also nouns that are singularia or pluralia tantum are common both in AG and MG.

⁵ Two of these groups consist of noun of all three genders, while one of them by masculine and feminine nouns. Generally male and female nouns have different inflexional suffixes.

	Athenians desired piece.	
PREDICATIVE COMPLEMENT	<i>I glossologhi ine <u>anthropi</u>!</i>	MG
	Linguists are humans!	
	<i>Pitharhia esti tis efpraksias <u>mitir</u>.</i>	AG
	Discipline is the mother of happiness.	
ii) In PP structure:		
COMPLEMENT	<i>Tha soso ton kosmo me tis <u>idees</u> mou.</i>	MG
	I will save the world with my ideas.	
	<i>Ifanizonto [kata tis <u>thalasis</u>].</i>	AG
	They disappeared under the sea.	
iii) In NP structure:		
COMPLEMENT	<i>I kritiki tis <u>kivernisis</u></i>	MG
	The criticism of the government	
	<i>Piisis <u>neon</u></i>	AG
	Construction of ships	

d) **Dependents.** Various kinds of dependents⁶ can occur with nouns as head.

[2]

i) DETERMINATIVES	<i>i tsanda, <u>ena</u> lathos, <u>ekastos</u> stratiotis,</i> the bag, a/ one mistake, every soldier
ii) ADNOMINAL ADJECTIVES	<i><u>eksipni</u> skepsi, <u>aksiopisti</u> efimerida, anir aghatos</i> smart thought, reliable newspaper, man good
iii) RELATIVE CLAUSES	<i>to astio <u>pou ekanes</u>, o neanias <u>os midhia</u></i> the joke you did, the teenager who smiles
iv) NOUNS	<i>mia epithimia <u>alagis</u>, piisis <u>neon</u></i> a desire for change, construction of ships
v) ADVERBS	<i>i <u>tote</u> kivernisi, i <u>pano</u> porta, i <u>sfodra</u> aghnia</i> the then government, the up door, the extreme ignorance

⁶ In the previous literature for both languages it is not always illustrated explicitly which grammatical categories can be dependents of a noun (meaning NP), whereas the types of the dependents (the function) are usually highlighted.

Dependents in the structure of the NP are mainly three: determiners⁷, complements and modifiers. Greek grammars (especially the ones written before the 80's) do not mention the concept of the NP, and the syntactic functions apply to grammatical categories and not to phrases. Still, grammars used as school textbooks (e.g. Chatzisavvidis and Chatzisavvidou 2009; Billa 2007) do not refer to e.g. modifiers in the structure of NP, but to modifiers of the noun. Also in Cleris and Babiniotis (2005) the distinction is not always clear. In addition, the majority of Greek grammars do not distinguish determiners from complements and complements from modifiers; all dependents are called modifiers. Contrarily, Holton, Mackridge and Philippaki-Warburton (1997) clearly illustrate grammatical classes and syntactic functions distinctively, and consider determiners, modifiers and complements as different types of dependents.

We will return to the question of dependents and their treatment in traditional grammars in chapter 3 when we will discuss the functions that adnominal adjectives can have.

2.2 Adjectives

According to traditional grammarians, the adjective typically attributes properties to the noun and limits or adds to the meaning of the noun. Cleris and Babiniotis (2005: 209) add that the adjective is the most basic means speakers have for that purpose. Pullum (2009: 257) on criticizing traditional definitions of adjectives notes that adjectives are standardly defined in terms of their syntactic function (modifier) and as a semantic notion (add to the meaning of nouns) and not as a grammatical category. It is very common in many grammars to classify participles as a sub-classification of adjectives (see Cleris and Babiniotis 2005) or to exemplify the class of adjectives by participles (see Mackridge 1985; Chatzisavvidis and Chatzisavvidou 2009). Using the distinctive properties discussed below, it is fairly easy to distinguish words that belong in these two categories.

⁷ Neither the class of determinatives, nor the syntactic functions of determiners is well used in Greek grammars. It is commonly suggested that articles, pronouns etc. function as modifiers to the noun (or NP). Here, we follow Huddleston (1984), Huddleston and Pullum (2002) and Holton, Mackridge and Philippaki-Warburton (1997). The latter refer to the class as determiners (in contrast to determinatives); however, they note specifically what is accounted in Modern Greek as belonging to the class of determinatives.

Distinctive properties of prototypical adjectives:

- a) **Inflection.** Adjectives typically inflect for number (singular or plural) and case (nominative, genitive, accusative and vocative)
- b) **Function.** Adjectives can have attributive and predicative use. Adjectives in attributive use function as pre- and post-head modifier to a noun; adjectives in predicative use function mainly as predicative complement in clause structure:

[3]

- i) Attributive use *to kalo podhilato* *me hamoghelo ghliko*
the good bicycle with a sweet smile
- ii) Predicative use *To podhilato ine kalo. To hamoghelo tou ine ghliko.*
‘The bicycle is good’ ‘His smile is sweet’

- c) **Gender.** Adjectives typically take three different suffixes depending on grammatical gender (masculine, feminine or neuter). In a phrase, adjectives assign for gender agreeing to the noun they depend on.

[4]

- | | | | |
|------|-----------|--------------|------------------|
| i) | <i>o</i> | <i>oreos</i> | <i>skilos</i> |
| | the.M.SG | nice.M.SG | dog.M.SG |
| ii) | <i>i</i> | <i>orees</i> | <i>tiropites</i> |
| | the.F.PL | nice.F.PL | cheesepie.F.PL |
| iii) | <i>to</i> | <i>oreo</i> | <i>ladi</i> |
| | the.N.SG | nice.N.SG | oil.N.SG |

- d) **Grade.** They either inflect for grade, showing a contrast between plain, comparative and superlative forms, or else form⁸ comparative and superlative adjective phrases (AdjPs) marked by *pio* ‘more’ and *o/ i/ to pio* ‘the M./F./N. most’:

[5]

- | | PLAIN | COMPARATIVE | SUPERLATIVE |
|----|----------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|
| i) | <i>Ise dhinatos.</i> | <i>Ise dhinatotros apo emena.</i> | <i>Ise o dhinatotros.</i> |

⁸ Almost all adjectives can form comparative and superlative forms both by inflection and by adjective phrases.

- | | | | |
|-----|----------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| | You are strong. | You are stronger than me. | You are the strongest. |
| ii) | <i>Ine praktiko.</i> | <i>Ine pio praktiko apo ekino.</i> | <i>Ine to pio praktiko.</i> |
| | It is practical. | It is more practical than that. | It is the most practical. |

e) **Modification.** Adjectives can be modified, mainly by adverbs:

[6]

<i>poli vari</i>	<i>adhiamfisvitita ghoiteytikos</i>	<i>aprosmena pistos</i>
very heavy	indisputably charming	unexpectedly faithful

2.3 Nouns vs Adjectives

Mackridge (1985: 40) notes that adjectives behave really similarly to nouns both syntactically and morphologically; it is not a fortuitous event that even in grammar books some nouns are considered to be adjectives (e.g. *vlakas* (idiot) in Tzermias (1969: 179) is called an adjective). Thus, setting the properties of both categories is important also for distinguishing nouns from adjectives. Following Huddleston and Pullum's (2005) strategy for distinguishing categories, we list the most critical properties of both classes so that the differences between them will become clearer. Again, everything listed below applies to both AG and MG:

a) **Inflection.** Adjectives typically have three different forms⁹ for each grammatical gender (masculine, feminine or neuter); nouns never do¹⁰. In addition, adjectives typically have comparative and superlative inflected forms¹¹, while nouns never do.

⁹ All adjectives shape three gender forms although not always inflected (loan word e.g. *roz*, *ble* 'blue').

¹⁰ There are however some cases where a noun can inflect for gender, but only for masculine and feminine, and never neuter. In these cases, mainly when it denotes a profession, the grammatical gender of a noun is determined by natural gender. There are nouns which take different suffixes for masculine and feminine forms as in i) and nouns that do not as in ii).

i) o *dhaskalos* (the teacher. M.), i *dhaskala* (the teacher. F.)

ii) o *ghlossologhos* (the linguist.M), i *ghlossologhos* (the linguist.F.)

¹¹ Not all adjectives have comparative and superlative forms.

[7]

THREE GENDER FORMS			COMPARATIVE FORMS	
i) a. ADJ	<i>kalos</i> , -i, -o	<i>atihis</i> , -is, -is	b. <i>kaliteros</i> , -i, o	<i>atihesteros</i> , -i, -o
	good (M,-F,-N)	unlucky (M,-F,-N)	better (M,-F,-N)	unluckier (M,-F,-N)
ii) a. N	<i>anthropos</i> , *-i, *-o	* <i>efhis</i> , -i, *-i	b. * <i>anthropoteros</i>	* <i>efxesteros</i>
	human (M,*-F,*-N)	wish(*M,-F,*-N)	humaner	wisher

b) **Modifiers.** As seen above both nouns and adjectives can be modified. Nouns can be modified by adjectives whereas adjectives cannot be modified by adjectives. On the other hand adjectives are usually modified by adverbs. Nouns typically cannot¹² take adverbs derived morphologically from adjectives as modifier.

[8]

i) ADJ	<i>endiposiaka</i> <u><i>kalos</i></u>	<i>adhika</i> <u><i>atihis</i></u>
	impressively good	unfairly unlucky
but	* <i>endiposiakos</i> <u><i>kalos</i></u>	* <i>adhikos</i> <u><i>atihis</i></u>
	impressive good	unfair unlucky
ii) N	<i>endiposiakos</i> <u><i>anthropos</i></u>	<i>adhiki</i> <u><i>efhi</i></u>
	impressive man	unfair wish
but	* <i>endiposiaka</i> <u><i>anthropos</i></u>	* <i>adhika</i> <u><i>efhi</i></u>
	impressively man	unfairly wish

c) **Function.** There are cases where nouns function as attributive modifier so the attributive use cannot stand as a reliable criterion for distinguishing nouns from adjectives. As in English (Huddleston and Pullum 2005: 114), nouns contrarily to adjectives can be heads of phrases in subject and object position:

[9]

	SUBJECT	OBJECT
i) NOUN	<i>o</i> <u><i>anthropos</i></u> <i>perpatai</i>	<i>eho mia</i> <u><i>efhi</i></u>

¹² There are examples in spoken discourse where an adverb can modify a noun in order to give emphasis to the meaning of the noun e.g. *Ine poli dhaskalos* (He is very teacher), meaning that 'he is a great teacher'. However, this use is extremely rare.

the person walks

I have a wish

ii) ADJECTIVE

**o endiposiakos perpatai*

**eho mia endiposiaki*

the impressive walks

I have an impressive

2.4 Can adjectives turn into nouns?

The contradistinction above becomes more crucial when we come to criticize the term and concept of *ousiastikopiisi*¹³ ‘substantivization’ which is used, amongst other languages, for AG: the procedure of turning an adjective (or any other word or a whole clause) into a noun (Asonitis and Anagnostopoulos 1978: 17; Mastronarde 1994: 49). As they mention, it is the definite article¹⁴ that has the force to substantivize any part of speech. Here we focus on adjectives:

[10]

i) *O sofos en afto periferi tin ousian.* AG

The wise (man) in himself carries richness.

(M. Mon. 569)

ii) *I ritoriki estin antistrofos ti dhilektiki.* AG

Rhetoric (art) is respective to the dialectic (art).

(Arist. Rhet. A. 1354al)

Bacharakis (1995: 67) is even more explicit when he mentions that in cases where the modified noun is absent, the attributive modifier (he means the adjective) preceded by an article is substantivised as it takes the semantic and syntactic position of the absent noun.

Grammars for MG also use the term substantivization to denote the same process although they claim that a word is used as a noun (Mackridge 1985: 140; Holton, Mackridge and Philippaki – Warburton 1997: 515) and not that it actually

¹³ The etymology of this compound word derives from the words *ousiastiko* ‘substantive’ and *piisi* > *pio* ‘creation > make- create’. It denotes the procedure of creating a noun.

¹⁴ They continue saying that the definite article can also adjectivalize (and as far as I am aware of they are the only ones to use this term) a noun in genitive case, an adverb or any prepositional modifier (PP).

becomes a noun. Cleris and Babiniotis (2005: 357), use the term *syntaktiki onomatopiisi* ‘syntactic nominalization’ and not substantivization in consistency to the term *onoma* ‘noun’. Focusing on what is called substantivization or syntactic nominalization of the adjective, we should make explicit that it is not obligatory for the adjective to be proceeded by the definite article to be nominalized, a fact that is highlighted by Mackridge (1985: 140).

However, we argue that the adjective is not nominalised; it always modifies a noun which in these cases is absent. The adjective does not turn into a noun; it seems that it can have the noun’s functions (cf. [1] above) but what actually happens is that it is an AdjP modifying a NP where its head is absent. Agreement rules are also applied as the modifier agrees with the head that is absent. This argument is based on Huddleston and Pullum (2002) who discuss the phenomenon called *fusion of a modifier and a head of an NP*. Consider the following:

[11]

- | | | |
|------|--|----|
| i) | <i>I <u>orei</u> ehoun hrei ke plironoun me filia.</i> | MG |
| | The beautiful have debts and they repay with kisses. | |
| ii) | <i>To <u>kalo</u> ine oti iparhi faghito ghia olous.</i> | MG |
| | The good is that there is food for everyone. | |
| iii) | <i>Pia gramatiki thes? Tin <u>kanonistiki</u> i tin <u>perighrafiki</u>?</i> | MG |
| | Which grammar do you want? The prescriptive or the descriptive? | |
| iv) | <i>I <u>megaliteri</u> apo tis files mou einai i pio <u>kalodiatirimeni</u>.</i> | MG |
| | The oldest of my friends is the most well-kept. | |

In i) we understand *beautiful* to mean “beautiful people” while in ii) we understand the good thing. It is extremely common to use this kind of construction in Greek using a fused modifier-head when referring to a category of people or to a ‘thing’. In iii) the adjectives *prescriptive* and *descriptive* refer to *grammar*. In iv) both *oldest* and *well – kept* refers to one of the speaker’s friends.

Generally in AG and MG there is no restriction to fuse internal modifiers with the head in cases where the head of the NP is either implicit [13] i), ii), [14] i), ii) or referred to in the context. Especially in AG words like *man*, *human*, *son*, *soldier*, *woman*, *hand*, *thing*, *day* e.tc are usually omitted from the NP if they are modified

(Bacharakis 1995: 67). In sharp contrast to English there is no need to add *one* or a respective word as a head of the NP.

Chapter 3

Functions of the adnominal adjective

In this chapter we discuss the different functions of adnominal adjectives in AG and MG. As we mentioned in the previous chapter, traditional grammars of these languages often confuse function and form, so that they do not discuss explicitly which grammatical categories can be dependents of a noun (meaning NP), but they only present the types of dependents (the function). In particular, they categorize the dependents of nouns in terms of case agreement between the noun and the dependent. The two major categories of noun dependents are thus called **same-case modifiers** and **other-case modifiers**¹⁵. Below we show the two categories and their members, and the terminology used in traditional grammars:

[12]

1) Same-case modifiers

- a. Realised mainly by adjectives
 - i. Adjectival modifier
 - ii. Predicative modifier
- b. Realised mainly by nouns¹⁶ (never by adjectives)
 - i. Parathesis
 - ii. Epexegesis

2) Other-case modifiers

- a. Genitives (possessive, objective, subjective, place, time, partitive e.tc.)
- b. Datives (only for Attic Greek: objective)
- c. Accusatives (reference, quantity)

We will argue that the terminology and classification in [12] are inadequate for four reasons: i) it defines as ‘adjectival modifier’ items that are not adjectives; ii) it fails to recognize predicative adjunct as a type of dependent, a function that we will show is required for both AG and MG; iii) it defines all dependents as modifiers even

¹⁵ This is the literal translation of *omioptotos prosdhiorismos* (same-case modifier) and *eteroptotos prosdhiorismos* (other-case modifier).

¹⁶ For this reason parathesis and epexegesis are called *same-case substantive modifiers*.

though some of them are complements or determiners; iv) it classifies dependents on the basis of agreement and not of their function. Thus, we will criticize existing accounts and suggest other terms following Huddleston and Pullum (2002). At the same time, we will re-define the types of dependents found in AG and MG. and we will suggest that adnominal adjectives in MG can also have the function of *parathesis*, which traditional grammars only ascribe to nouns.

As the focus of this essay is on adnominal adjectives, we will not analyze the other-case modifiers; Adjectives always agree in case with the word they depend on so they do not function as other-case modifier

3.1 Adjectival modifier vs attributive modifier

Traditional Greek grammars call '*adjectival modifier*' the adjective that modifies a noun and attributes stable properties to the noun (Asonitis and Anagnostopoulos 1978: 35; Bacharakis 1995: 66; Chatzisavvidis and Chatzisavvidou 2009: 119); the '*adjectival modifier*' is attached so tightly to the noun that together they constitute one syntactic and semantic notion (Bacharakis 1995: 66).

This function can be realized in Attic and Modern Greek by adjectives, participles, pronouns, numerals, nouns. For that reason Bacharakis (1995: 66) characterizes these categories as adjectival (adjectival participle, adjectival pronoun and adjectival numeral respectively). In addition, adverbs, genitives and PPs can function as '*adjectival modifier*' when preceded by a definite article¹⁷. However, Joseph and Philippaki-Warbuton (1987) note that the use of the definite article is not obligatory for Modern Greek.

This term is, however, very problematic, as it illustrates confusion between the grammatical categorization of the adjective and a specific syntactic function. In addition, it transfers the same confusion and incomprehension to students. In terms of grammatical categorization, the adjective in Greek grammars is generally described as the word that attributes properties to the noun and limits or adds to the meaning of the noun. This definition, however, is based on semantics rather than morphosyntactic

¹⁷ This phenomenon is also called nominalization in Greek traditional grammar.

features and it is too vague to distinguish adjectives from other grammatical categories that may have similar meaning, e.g. *moro pedhi* (baby child).

Moreover, the term ‘*adjectival modifier*’ implies that adjectives cannot have other functions and it links this function only with adjectives while numerals, participles, nouns etc. can have this function too. There are many instances where grammar books mention that a word that is not an adjective functions as an adjective. What is meant is that in fact it functions as *attributive modifier*, as this function is not necessarily realized by an adjective.

For these reasons, in this essay the term **attributive modifier** will be used. Expanding the above-mentioned definition of this term found in Greek literature, we can say that a word functioning as attributive modifier attributes stable, time-independent properties to the noun. It functions as a pre- and post head internal dependent in the structure of the NP.

3.1.1 Ascriptive adjectives

Adjectives constitute the most common pre and post- head NP modifiers in AG and MG and they clearly are the default category in the attributive position (Payne and Huddleston 2002: 444; Giegerich 2006: 12). Attributive adjectives can be either ascriptive or associative. This distinction (ascriptive/associative) is of great importance for the comprehension of the functions a pre- and post-head adjective can have as well as for their interpretation.

Ascriptive adjectives express a property which is suitable for the entity represented by the modified noun (Ferris 1993: 24). Thus, the ascriptive nature of prototypical adjectives is evident in attributive function (Siegel 1980; Ferris 1993; Payne and Huddleston 2002; Giegerich 2006: 12).

[13]

- | | | |
|----------------------------------|---------------------|----|
| i) <i>o <u>akratos</u> inos</i> | the unmixed wine | AG |
| <i>i <u>dhikea</u> ghnomi</i> | the fair opinion | |
| <i>to <u>plousion</u> pnevma</i> | the rich spirit | |
| ii) <i>to <u>oreo</u> pedhi</i> | the beautiful child | MG |

<i>i <u>eksipni</u> idhea</i>	the smart idea
<i>to <u>palio</u> vivlio</i>	the old book

The semantics of ascription allows a predicative usage of ascriptive adjectives where the copula combines the head noun with the complement (Giegerich 2006: 12).

[14]

i) <i>o inos estin <u>akratos</u></i>	the wine is unmixed	AG
<i>i ghnomi esti <u>dhikea</u>.</i>	the opinion is fair	
<i>to pnevma esti <u>plousion</u>.</i>	the spirit is rich	
ii) <i>To pedhi ine <u>oreo</u>.</i>	the child is beautiful	MG
<i>I idhea ine <u>eksipni</u>.</i>	the idea is smart	
<i>To vivlio ine <u>palio</u>.</i>	the book is old	

3.1.2 Associative adjectives

Non-ascriptive adjectives in Greek, as also in English (Ferris 1993, Pullum and Huddleston, Giegerich 2006), are associative. That means that they denote “a property which does not apply directly to the denotation of the head, but rather to some entity associated with it” (Pullum and Huddleston 2002: 556); “the property of the adjective...is true of that which is designated by the noun” (Ferris 1993: 21). Cleris and Babiniotis (2005) are the only ones (as far as I am aware) who mention this categorization for Modern Greek. What is remarkable is that, again to my knowledge, there is no reference on this categorization about Attic Greek. This does not mean that they did not exist though. We exemplify this group (associative adjectives) in both languages:

[15]

	ASCRPTIVE USE	ASSOCIATIVE USE	
i)	<i>moderna tehni</i>	<i>moderno forema</i>	MG
	modern art	modern dress	

ii)	<u>asiatiko rizi</u>	<u>asiatiki ghripi</u>	MG
	Asian rice	Asian flue	

Only associative:

[16]

i)	<u>osfrantikon esthitirion</u>	<u>amfiktionikon ieron</u>	AG
	sense associated to the nose	temple associated to an Amphictiony ¹⁸	

ii)	<u>politiki satira</u>	<u>to gheoghrafiko mili</u>	<u>to odhontiko nima</u>	MG
	political satire	the geographical mile	the dental floss	

In English these adjectives usually have an obvious semantic similarity with a noun where the adjective's meaning is 'pertaining to ..., associated with ...' (Giegerich 2006: 12). This is also the case for Modern Greek. In [16] ii) *satire* is associated with *politics*, *mile* pertains to *geography* and *floss* is associated with *teeth*.

This semantic relationship is realized also morphologically. Pullum and Huddleston (2002: 557) note that many of these adjectives are formed by adding suffixes to nouns (e.g. -al, -ar). Similarly, in Greek the majority of these adjectives are derived from nouns with suffixes like -ikos, -iki, -iko (for masculine, feminine and neuter respectively). I am not sure if this is the case also for AG, as there is no list of associative adjectives is found in the literature. More research is warranted on this topic.

A diagnostic test to identify associative adjectives (or the associative use of the adjective) suggested by Ferris (1993: 21) for adjectives that can be both ascriptive and associative is:

'This [Noun] is [Adjective]'.

In case that this sentence is grammatical, the adjective cannot be associative as, followed by the semantics of association, associative adjectives or adjectives used associatively cannot appear in predicative function (Ferris 1993: 21). That is also the

¹⁸ "An Amphictiony is an association of neighbouring states formed around a religious centre. The most important was the Amphictionic League (Delphic Amphictiony)" (Encyclopaedia Britannica).

case for predicative position other than the predicative complement, as predicative adjuncts in Attic and Modern Greek cannot be realized by associative adjectives.

We will see below that this distinctive nature of the ascriptive/associative use affects the word order of adjectives in cases where an NP is modified by several AdjPs, as well as that the use of associative adjectives is much more restricted than the use of ascriptive adjectives.

It is worth mentioning that Huddleston and Pullum (2002) categorize adjectives like *legal adviser* and *ecological expert* as pre-head complements in the NP. However, adjectives like *medical journal* and *mathematical genius* are classified as associative attributives (Huddleston and Pullum 2002). It is not really obvious what the difference between these adjectives is (also for the respective adjectives in Greek) and thus not obvious why this distinction is drawn. However, this distinction creates interesting questions for future research, such as, what is the function of associative adjectives in the NP? Is it a complement or a modifier?

3.2 Predicative modifier

This term is a literal translation from the Greek term ‘katighorimatikos prosdhiorismos’ and it is a term used exclusively in Greek traditional grammars for Ancient Greek, Latin and Modern Greek. In fact, it is strange that the majority of less traditional grammars do not comment on this function or structure at all.

The predicative modifier is defined, in sharp contrast to the attributive modifier, as giving temporal properties to the noun or modifying one part of the term (Asonitis and Anagnostopoulos 1978: 37; Bacharakis 1995: 68; Billa 2007: 28; Tsolakis 2003: 41 Chatzisavvidis and Chatzisavvidou 2009: 119). This property can be opposed to other stable properties of the noun that is modified (Asonitis and Anagnostopoulos 1978: 37; Bacharakis 1995: 68; Tsolakis 2003: 41 Billa 2007: 29; Chatzisavvidis and Chatzisavvidou 2009: 119).

The predicative modifier, as mentioned above, always agrees in case, gender and number with the noun it modifies as also exemplified below in [20]. It can either

precede or follow the noun. Examples¹⁹ found in the literature illustrate the functions of predicative modifiers:

[17]

i) *Ihon tis aspidhes ekekalimenas.* AG
they had the shields uncovered.

(Asonitis and Anagnostopoulos 1978: 37)

ii) *Aghisilaos fedhro to prosopo ekelefsen.* AG
Agiselaus smiling.DAT. the face.DAT. instructed.
Agiselaus, with a smiling face, gave instructions.

(Bacharakis 1995: 68 by Xen.Agis.1.13.)

iii) *Miso ton andhra kakon.* AG
I hate the man bad
'I hate the man when he is bad.'

(Bacharakis 1995: 68)

iv) *Iflizonto egehalinomenis tis ipis.* AG
slept bridled the horses.
'They slept with the horses bridled.'

(Asonitis and Anagnostopoulos 1987: 37)

v) *I thalassa ghalinia mas proskalouse.* MG
the sea peaceful us invited.
'The sea, peaceful, was inviting us.'

(Tsolakis 2003: 44)

vi) *Katahlomos o papas kitouse to nero.* MG
pale the priest was staring the water.
'Pale, the priest was staring at the water'

(Tsolakis 2003: 44)

Here, grammarians are indeed right. The adjective functioning as predicative modifier expresses a time-dependant property. In [17] i) the shields we are talking about were not generally uncovered shields – they were uncovered at that point of time. Or in [17] ii) Agiselaus did not spend his whole year back in 396 B.C smiling. At a certain

¹⁹ Here we will use examples found in grammars so that we can use them to compare the functions *predicative modifier* and *adverbial predicative complement*.

point in which he was giving instructions, he had a smiling face. However, the interpretation of these clauses gives us more semantic evidence. In i), ii), iv) and v) the property of manner is expressed whereas in iii) the property of time is expressed. We argue then that the predicative modifier gives properties like that of manner, time, place, purpose and order-degree; these are the properties that adjuncts also express. We will come back to this in the next section.

Traditional grammars for Attic Greek mention that there are certain words that usually function as predicative modifier if not preceded by a definite article. Asonitis and Anagnostopoulos (1978: 38) and Bacharakis (1995: 69) count in this list the demonstrative pronoun *aftos* (this) and the items *akros* (the edge of something), *mesos* (middle of something), *eshatos* (the last-part of something), *monos* (alone), *erimos* (alone, empty), *olos* (all), *pas* (entire, whole), *apas* (entire, whole, each), *simpas* (entire, whole, each), *ekastos*²⁰ (each), which they all call adjectives. The first three items change their meaning if preceded by a definite article: *o akros* (the eminent), *o mesos* (medium, mean), *o eshatos* (the extreme, the maximal). *Monos* (alone) and *erimos* (alone, empty) cannot be used attributively. As for the rest, they are not adjectives, but determiners, a category that is not recognised in traditional grammar.

Traditional grammars (Chatzisavvidis and Chatzisavvidou 2009: 119; Tsolakis 2003: 45) for Modern Greek mention almost the same words as adjectives that usually function as predicative modifier: *olos* (all), *olokliros* (whole), *misos* (half), *monos* (single), *dhiplos* (double), *monos*²¹ (alone). Again, these words (except for alone) should not be classified as adjectives.

Interestingly, Bolinger (1967) and Baker (2003: 209) amongst others note that in English-type languages adjectives that are used only predicatively all denote very transitory properties. Even though this is a big generalization, it seems to apply also to many adjectives used only predicatively in Greek.

However, the term *predicative modifier*, as used in traditional grammars, does not seem to refer to a function different from the function described by the term *predicative adjunct*. To show this, the function of predicative adjunct as defined in Greek grammars must be illustrated. The literal translation of the term used in Greek

²⁰ Bacharakis (1995: 68) classifies it as pronoun.

²¹ *Monos*, as mentioned, cannot be used attributively. However, if preceded by a definite article, it is used attributively, but its meaning changes. This will be analyzed in more depth in Chapter 5.

is *adverbial predicative complement* (*epirimatiko katighoroumeno*). Examples²² of what traditional grammarians call *adverbial predicative complement* are illustrated below:

[18]

i) *o kiriks apilthen apraktos.* AG

the promoter.NOM left empty-handed.NOM

‘The promoter left empty-handed’

(Bacharakis 1995: 58 by Th. IV.99)

ii) *asmeni idhon alilous.* AG

happy.NOM (they.NOM) see each other

‘Happy (they) saw each other’

(Bacharakis 1995: 58 by Xen. *K.An.VI.3.24*)

iii) *O vorias sfirize aghrios.* MG

The wind.NOM was blowing wild.NOM

‘The wind was blowing wild’

(Tsolakis 2003: 19)

iv) *O Kostas tous dhehotan orthios.* MG

Kostas them welcome standing

‘Kostas was welcoming them standing’

(Tsolakis 2003: 19)

The adjective in this function is not adnominal, and it always agrees in case, gender and number with the noun it modifies. However, according to traditional Greek grammars an *adverbial predicative complement* is not considered to be one of the noun’s dependents (meaning NP) but one of the verb’s (meaning VP). Thus, they suggest that the *adverbial predicative complement* modifies only the verb, and for this reasons it is equivalent to an adverb (Asonitis and Anagnostopoulos 1978: 19; Bacharakis 1995: 58; Tsolakis 2003: 19), which partly explains its name. More specifically, grammars mention that the *adverbial predicative complement* is usually a dependent of verbs that mean movement. Chatzisavvidis and Chatzisavvidou (2009: 135) suggest that the *adverbial predicative complement* is a subcategory of the

²² Again we use examples found in grammars so that we use them to compare the functions *predicative modifier* and *adverbial predicative complement*.

‘*adverbial modifier*’ class that is realized not by adverbs, but by adjectives expressing manner, time etc. This explanation does not help us understand their opinion about this function (that is, whether it is a dependent of an NP or a VP). Moreover, when they exemplify this function they do not use an adjective but a participle. It is commonly accepted that it can express manner, time, place, purpose and order-degree (Asonitis and Anagnostopoulos 1978: 19; Bacharakis 1995: 58; Chatzisavvidis and Chatzisavvidou 2009: 136). Actually in MG they express mainly manner (Cleris and Babinotis 2005: 564) and time. I will discuss each point (terminology and dependency) in turn.

3.2.1 The term ‘adverbial predicative complement’

- *Adverbial?*

Firstly, the term *adverbial predicative complement* does not seem to be corresponding to the function it describes. Again the word *adverbial*, as the term *adjectival modifier*, is tightly related to a grammatical category – here the one of adverbs. The use of the term *adverb*, or *adverbial* is really common in grammars to denote the function realized by words or phrases expressing place, time e.tc. However, it is much preferable to use a term that describes the syntactic function and not the grammatical category of the item that prototypical realizes it.

- *Complement?*

On the other hand, it is misguided to talk about a predicative complement, as it is not functioning as complement. A complement is licensed by the verb (copula, or other verbs) whereas an adjunct is not licensed; (Huddleston and Pullum 2005: 119). In [21] the adjectives are not licensed by a certain verb; they are used as adjuncts or supplements. In addition, complements are more restricted than most adjuncts (Huddleston 2002:224). In the above exemplified cases [21] all adjectives can appear freely in any position a fact which supports that the function in question is not a complement but an adjunct.

- *Predicative?*

The term predicative indicates that an item is related to a predicand (Huddleston and Pullum 2005: 119). With almost no exceptions, the predicative adjunct in Greek is realized by adjectives which always agree in gender, case and number with the predicand and semantically refer to it, as also seen in [21] i), ii) and iii). Asonitis and Anagnostopoulos (1978: 19), Bacharakis (1995: 58) and Tsolakis (2003: 19) among others argue that the *adverbial predicative complement* modifies only the verb as it equals the adverb and can be replaced by one. Even though in many cases in AG and MG the adjective in this function always expresses what adverbs do, it cannot always be replaced by an adverb:

[19]

- | | |
|---|---|
| i) a. <i>o andras efighe viastikos</i>
the man left quick | b. <i>o andras efighe viastika</i>
the man left quickly |
| ii) a. <i>o andras perpatai ghimnos</i>
the man walkes naked | b. <i>*o andras perpatai ghimna</i>
the man walkes nakedly |

Thus, we can argue that the function in question is not a complement, not a dependent of the VP but an adjunct related clearly to a predicand (either overt [18] i) and iii) or covert [18] ii)). Therefore we will abandon the traditional term and use *predicative adjunct* instead.

3.2.2 The function: predicative modifier vs predicative adjunct

After explaining the reasons for suggesting alternative terminology (*predicative adjunct* by Huddleston and Pullum 2002) and its properties, we can solve the aforementioned problem; that is whether the terms *predicative modifier* and *predicative adjunct* describe the same function or not. Examples of both functions are juxtaposed:

[20]

- | | | |
|---|---|----|
| PREDICATIVE MODIFIER | PREDICATIVE ADJUNCT | |
| i) a. <i>O dikastis iremos apofasise.</i> | b. <i>O dhikastis apofasise iremos.</i> | MG |

- | | | | |
|--------|---|--|----|
| | The judge calm decided. | The judge decided calm. | |
| ii) a. | <i><u>Apraktos</u> o kiriks apilthen.</i> | <i>b. O kiriks apilthen <u>apraktos</u>.</i> | AG |
| | empty-handed the promoter left. | The promoter left empty-handed. | |

Using the examples from [17], [18] and [20] we observe:

- a) In all cases the adjective agrees in case, number and gender with the noun it modifies.
- b) In all cases all adjectives express one of the aforementioned meanings (manner, time, location etc.).
- c) In both [17] and [18] the adjective can function as a modifier to an NP in subject position, and it can move freely in the clause structure. In addition, in these cases the adjective can be replaced by an adverb.
- d) In all of them, the adjective is never preceded by a definite article and the modified noun is.
- e) The differences in [20] are only in the word order which does not change the meaning neither in AG nor in MG. However, the focus appears to what is pre-posed. However, i) a) and b) denote the same thing: the *judge* was feeling *calm* when he decided.
- f) In the literature, the label *predicative adjunct* is only used for dependents of NPs in subject (and less often in object) position, whereas *predicative modifier* is used for NPs in subject and object position as well as to other NPs (e.g. [17] ii) an NP in dative translated as a PP). In addition, all examples of predicative modifiers found in grammars are adnominal and all examples of *predicative adjunct* are not attached to the NP they modify.

Bearing in mind that both functions express manner, time etc., and that they are both NP dependents, the only difference between these two functions is that the predicative modifier is adnominal whereas the predicative adjunct is not. That is, we have an item that, in traditional grammars, is given a different function based solely on its position in the linear word order of the clause. It seems more parsimonious to choose only one label and argue that it is not affected the adjective's position in the clause, as it clearly is the case.

One wonders why traditional grammars distinguish these two functions. Maybe they used *predicative modifier* to highlight a function that comes in sharp

contrast with the attributive modifier. This is probably why the term predicative modifier was always applied to an adnominal adjective, found in a construction which looks really similar to the construction in which the attributive modifier appears. More likely, the fact that the adjective is far from the NP it modifies has made grammarians reluctant to call his function ‘modifier, hence the ‘*adverbial predicative complement*’ term. This possibly explains why, the majority of examples found in the literature (for AG and MG) to define and exemplify the *predicative adjunct* function are clauses with a covert predicand as Greek is a pro-drop language and often omits the subject.

It should be stressed that we can only guess what the reasons for the two labels are, because traditional grammars never explicitly compare them. However, from the examples that they use, it seems that they only use the term modifier only for adjectives in adnominal position. We suggest that the term *predicative adjunct* should be used for all adjectives used in any predicative function other than predicative complement.

3.2.3 Adjectives functioning as predicative adjunct

As mentioned above, Ferris (1993: 28) notes that associative adjectives do not occur in predicative position. He explains that while predication expresses the intentional relation of assignment and assignment requires that the property of the adjective should be applied to the referent of the NP, associative adjectives do not strongly apply a property to a noun. Associative adjectives are thus excluded from the function of the predicative adjunct. Also Levi (1978) calls this kind of adjectives non-predicating adjectives and explains that they are excluded from the predicative position even though there are some cases where they do appear predicatively in normal English discourse.

Pullum and Huddleston (2002: 529) note that all adjectives that can function as predicative adjunct can also function as predicative complement, a function that associative adjectives cannot have. Similarly associative adjectives do not function as predicative adjuncts in Greek. Furthermore, adjectives denoting color and material are not allowed in this function, which conforms with what grammarians notice about the properties of this function when they say that it gives time-dependent properties.

As mentioned above, *parathesis* and *epexegetis* are classified as ‘*substantive same-case modifiers*’. Grammars suggest that parathesis and epexegetis are always realized by NPs. However, I will argue that this is not always the case.

3.3 Parathesis

The NP functioning as parathesis denotes a more generic notion than the referent of the modified noun. It is a post-head modifier. The OED explains the term as “the placing of a word or phrase beside, or in syntactic parallelism with, another; the juxtaposition of two or more grammatically parallel words or phrases (as in *our friend the doctor*)”. Any noun, phrase or clause can be used as *parathesis* (Chatzisavvidis and Chatzisavvidou 2009: 117; Cleris and Babiniotis 2005: 256).

[21]

- | | | |
|-----|---|----|
| i) | <i>o Socratis o <u>philosophos</u></i> | MG |
| | Socrates the philosopher | |
| ii) | <i>Pafsanias o <u>vasilefs</u> fthonisas Lisandro</i> | AG |
| | Pafsanias the king who envied Lysander | |

(Xen. *Hell.*2.4.29)

Parathesis can be replaced by a relative clause:

[22]

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|----|
| <i>O Socratis, pou ine filosofos</i> | MG |
| Socrates, who is a philosopher | |

However, we argue that in Modern Greek it is possible also for an adjective to realize this function:

[23]

- | | | |
|----|--------------------------|----|
| i) | <i>o Jannis o psilos</i> | MG |
| | the John the tall | |
| | ‘John the tall one’ | |

- ii) *To alogo to geriko* MG
the horse the old
‘the horse the old one’

3.4 Epexegetis

Epexegetis is “the addition of a word or words to convey more clearly the meaning implied or the specific sense intended, in a preceding word or sentence” (OED). A word or words are added for this purpose. It is an external modifier that refers to a more general term and it specifies it. The word ‘*dhiladi*’ (namely) can intervene between the two NPs:

[24]

- i) *i Elines apopembousi dhora dhondes [...] ipon ke fialin arghira* AG
The Greeks send (the messenger) away after giving gifts, a horse and a silver pot.
(Xen.K.An.4.7.27)
- ii) *Afti ine i dhinami tou, to mialo tou* MG
This is his strength, his mind.

Epexegetis cannot be realized by an AdjP. It is worth noting here what actually changes between *parathesis* and *epexegetis* is nothing more than the word order. In *parathesis* something specified is expressed first and then the more generic notion. On the contrary, in *epexegetis* the generic notion comes first and then it is specified.

3.5 Critique of the traditional categorization

So far I have explained the terms used in traditional grammar and I have re-defined them. I have also argued that adjectives can be used as *parathesis*. In this section, I argue that the traditional categorization that I showed at the beginning of this chapter [12] is not accurate for several reasons. Firstly, the categorization is based on case

agreement and not on the syntactic function of the dependents. By distinguishing all dependents of the noun in terms of case agreement the outcome is a great inconsistency: a) not all dependents are modifiers and b) the dependents that are not inflected (e.g. adverbs) are not included to this categorization. I will explain these two problems in turn.

a) Not all dependents are modifiers.

Except for modifiers, other types of dependents like complements and determiners exist. However, in terms of the traditional categorization for AG and MG every dependent (even complements and determiners) is defined as modifier. Even though these kind of dependents (that is, so-called *other-case modifiers*) are out of the scope of this project, it is really interesting to refer to how this confusion applies to Greek high-school students.

It is a common phenomenon for students to be confused as they often do not capture the difference between grammatical categories and syntactic function. Some mistakes they make actually reveal inconsistencies in the terminology. A real example is:

[25]

i kritiki tis apofasis tou

theNOM. criticismNOM the.GEN. decision.GEN his

‘The criticism of his decision’

The syntactic analysis according to the traditional grammar is that the noun (it is meant NP) *apofasis* functions as other-case modifier and more specifically it is in genitive as opposed to the nominative case of the noun *i kritiki*. The function of the NP *tis apofasis* according to traditional grammars would be an ‘objective genitive’ since if the noun *I kritiki* was a verb then the NP in genitive case would function as a complement, an object (i.e. I criticize the decision).

The problem is that it is very common for students to say that the NP *tis apofasis* is an object to the noun. Undoubtedly, nouns in contrast to verbs do not permit objects (Huddleston and Pullum 2002). However, this answer actually shows a deeper understanding of the structure of the phrase; students (especially the ones that have not learnt the terminology by heart) understand that this NP in the genitive case is a complement rather than a modifier!

b) Dependents that are not inflected are not included in this categorization.

Students do not have a clear picture about the whole range of nouns' dependents, as everything outside of [12] is only vaguely described as an item that can realize some types of nouns' dependents. It makes more sense to say that nouns can take a range of dependents and to list them without categorizing them according to morphological criteria, as we did [2] in chapter 2.

The three functions analyzed (Attributive modifier, Predicative adjunct, Parathesis) will be crucial for the discussion of all possible constructions in which the adnominal adjective can appear.

Chapter 4

Definiteness and indefiniteness in modified NPs

In both Modern and Attic Greek the presence or the absence of a definite article and its position determine the function of the dependent AdjP and can affect crucially the semantics of the NP. The pre or post nominal position of the adjective also plays an important role. First we shall demonstrate how definiteness and indefiniteness work in NPs in Attic Greek and Modern Greek separately as there are differences between the two languages.

4.1 Attic Greek

4.1.1 Definiteness

The definite article in Attic Greek has the same form as the definite article in Modern Greek *o*, *i*, *to*, for the masculine, feminine and neutral form respectively. In Attic Greek the definite article²³ has multiple uses. Its two main uses are to **specify** but also to **generalize** the noun that it precedes (Bacharakis 1995: 254). In addition, there are cases where the definite article functions as a possessive pronoun. Furthermore it can have the meaning of *every one* or *each one*.

4.1.2 Indefiniteness in Attic Greek

Attic Greek, contrarily to Modern Greek, lacks an indefinite article. Indefiniteness is notified by the absence of the definite article. There are, however, certain cases where the absence of the definite article does not reflect the indefiniteness of the NP, as

²³ Initially, the definite article in Ancient Greek was a demonstrative pronoun which is overt in Homer's and Hesiod's work. This use did not expire entirely in Attic Greek where many idiomatic phrases are used. This pragmatic and semantic function change has happened also in other languages like German and Romance languages (Lyons 1999).

proper nouns²⁴ are usually not preceded by a definite article. There is, however, a “marked” use of the definite article with a proper noun e.g. in cases where the name is already mentioned and the definite article indicates that it is the aforementioned person that is being referred to (Welo 2008: 5).

4.2 Modern Greek

4.2.1 Definiteness in Modern Greek

Definiteness and indefiniteness in nouns in Modern Greek work noticeably differently than in most Germanic and Romance languages. Nouns can be optionally marked as definite through the use of the definite article, the form of which depends on the number, case, and gender of the nominal it is associated with (Joseph and Philippaki-Warburton 1987: 153). In sharp contrast to English and most Romance languages²⁵, MG regularly marks definiteness with proper nouns e.g. ‘*o Janis*’ (the John), ‘*to Edhimvurgho*’ (the Edinburgh) (Joseph and Philippaki-Warburton 1987: 153).

Adjectives that modify nouns can also be preceded by a definite article. All grammatical cases nouns or adjectives can take a definite article except for the vocative as its function presupposes definiteness. Thus, examples in all cases except for vocative (nominative, genitive, accusative) will be used.

4.2.2 Indefiniteness in Modern Greek

Nouns can be optionally marked as indefinite, chiefly through the use of numeral ‘*enas*’ (one), fulfilling the function of an indefinite article (Joseph and Philippaki-Warburton 1987: 153). Also the absence altogether of an article marks a nominal as indefinite (Joseph and Philippaki-Warburton 1987: 153). Alternatively, indefiniteness can be expressed by a form of indefinite pronouns (Joseph and Philippaki-Warburton 1987: 153).

²⁴ There are though some counterexamples; the nouns *vasilefs* (king) and *asty* (city) when not preceded by the definite article denote the king of Persia and Athens respectively.

²⁵ However, in German it is possible to use a definite article before a proper noun when referring with emphasis to a certain person e.g. *Die Stephanie*.

Bacharakis (1995: 256) notes that in AG the adjective functioning as predicative complement is usually not preceded by a definite article which is also the case in MG. It is interesting though that usually it is not preceded by an indefinite article²⁶ either. There must be a link between this and the fact that adjectives functioning as *predicative adjuncts* (in traditional grammar: *predicative modifier*) are always bare.

In this project we will analyze the NP with adjectival modification in constructions where definiteness or indefiniteness is determined by the existence/absence of a definite article (i.e. NPs in which indefiniteness is expressed by pronouns or the numeral will not be part of this analysis).

4.3 Possible positions of the article in AG and MG

There are four constructions to consider in an NP with an adnominal adjective:

[26]

- i) a definite article precedes only the adjective
- ii) no definite article precedes either the adjective or the noun
- ii) a definite article precedes both the adjective and the noun
- iii) a definite article precedes only the noun

4.3.1 Functions of the AdjP in each construction

Asonitis and Anagnostopoulos (1978: 37) suggested a systematic table that illustrates the cases where each function appears in terms of the presence/absence and the position of the definite article. Based on this pattern we will suggest a rephrased table for AG (with minor differences) and a new pattern for MG. Furthermore, we propose that word order can also affect the syntactic function of the AdjP and thus the semantics of the whole NP.

²⁶ The predicative complement is preceded by a definite or indefinite article only in cases where there is a deictic use:

Aftos ine o kathighitis.
This is the teacher.

[27]

Attic Greek

- The **adnominal** adjective can function as *attributive modifier* when:
 1. only the adjective takes a definite article
 2. both the adjective and noun take a definite article
 3. neither the adjective nor the noun take a definite article

- The adjective (adnominal or otherwise) can function as *predicative adjunct* when:
 1. only the noun takes a definite article and the adjective is bare
 2. In rare cases where both the adjective and the noun do not take a definite article

[28]

Modern Greek

- The **adnominal** adjective can function as *attributive modifier*, when:
 1. only the adjective takes a definite article
 2. both the adjective and noun take a definite article
 3. neither the adjective nor the noun take a definite article

- The adjective (adnominal or otherwise) can function as *predicative adjunct* when:
 1. only the noun takes a definite article and the adjective is bare
 2. In rare cases where both the adjective and the noun do not take a definite article

- The **post-nominal** adjective can function as *parathesis*, when:
 1. both the adjective and noun take a definite article

4.4 Possible word order in AG and MG

Even though grammars of AG use examples in which the AdjP precedes the head noun as well as examples in which the AdjP follows the head noun, they do not explicitly mention that the AdjP can precede or follow the head noun. Thus, they do not notice word order may affect meaning or information structure. Furthermore, they do not comment on the interpretation or the use of all constructions in which the AdjP has the same function. This is also apparent in the interpretation they give to the examples used. Finally, they do not mention that not all possible word order combinations are found in Ancient Greek texts.

Grammars of MG do not comment either on the variation of structures; not even on the several constructions which include an attributive modifier. They usually have a simple comment on the variation of the word order suggesting that it is used for emphasis.

The possible constructions that can be found for AG and MG are:

[29]

D= Definite article

A= Adjective

N= Noun

i) Attic Greek	ii) Modern Greek
1. a. D + A + N b. N + D + A	1. a. D + A + N b. (?) ²⁷ N + D + A
2. a. A + N b. N + A	2. a. A + N b. N + A
3. a. *D + A + D + N b. D + N + D + A	3. a. D + A + D + N b. D + N + D + A
4. a. A + D + N b. D + N + A	4. a. A + D + N b. D + N + A

In the next chapter we will discuss each one of these constructions.

²⁷ The (?) is used to suggest that this construction is of questionable acceptability.

Chapter 5

Analysis of each construction in Attic Greek and Modern Greek

Even though according to the tables [28] and [29] the AdjP can have the same syntactic function in several constructions, we still did not cover whether their meaning is the same. Generally it is stated for AG and MG (see Mastronarde 1994; Mackridge 1985) that the rich inflectional system causes a not rigid word order and that the order of words may be altered to suit stylistic goals or to affect emphasis. We argue that this is not as simple a case as that. Each construction can be used in different cases to express different meanings, even though the difference is not always so obvious and sharp. We will illustrate each construction/function in turn starting from the most common structure. This time, we will not treat the two languages together, as they have fundamental differences.

For Attic Greek, where native speakers are not so easy to find any more – for obvious reasons, our interpretation of these structures can only be based on actually attested examples, and we cannot appeal to native intuition. For this project texts mainly by Herodotus are used.

5.1 Constructions in Attic Greek

Traditional grammars and textbooks for Attic Greek (written in Greek and other languages) seem to imply that all possible constructions are equally grammatical and with an equal meaning. In fact, they do not comment on this issue at all, even if, when they translate examples into MG, the meaning difference is obvious. We will argue that the variation of patterns in which the AdjP has the same function is not random; usually the construction used depends on the way information is structured both in the clause and in the wider discourse.

We have to notice two basic things that are not stated in any grammar books for students and teachers. Firstly, it is not mentioned that not all possible combinations are grammatical. D+A+D+N is not grammatical, that is, it is never found in texts (Welo 2008: 188), even though someone would expect for this construction to be possible as all other construction are found in different word order.

Secondly, grammars do not mention if there exists a default position. In most examples they use the AdjP precedes the NP, which is the default position for MG, but not for AG. Bergson (1960), Dik (1997), Welo (2008) and Bakker (2008) note that the default position for these constituents in the NP is the for the noun to proceed and the adjective to follow. However, that does not mean that the other constructions are not used, but that they are marked and that therefore they carry an extra semantic meaning.

First we will illustrate those constructions where the AdjP is used attributively and then the predicative ones.

5.1.1 AdjP as attributive modifier

D+A+N

According to many scholars (Smyth 1956: 293; Mastronarde 1995: 49), the most common construction in AG is the D+A+N.

[30]

<i>o kalos anir</i>	<i>i aghathi ghini</i>	<i>to hrisoun dhendhron</i>
the beautiful man	the good woman	the golden tree

This construction can be found in all possible positions in the clause structure (subject, object, predicative complement, NP complement, PP complement), while Welo (2008: 7) adds that it is a really mobile construction as it can be found in a clause both in cases where it introduces new information as well as in cases where it is the reference of something presupposed.

Interestingly, this construction is also the most common in many other languages like English, German, French, Modern Greek. Welo (2008: 6) argues that it is for that reason that we might falsely assume that the meaning of D+A+N are equivalent in all these languages.

As seen in texts this construction is used to refer to a certain referent of the noun that holds the property denoted by the adjective. Of course, the emphasis here is on the adjective as it is pre-posed. Dik (1997), in her extensive work on Herodotus, argues that the default position of the noun is always to precede the adjective. She

also notes that the adjective precedes the noun when it is used to contrast other elements in the clause or the context. However, this construction is also mainly used when the adjective is the most salient element of the NP: for example, NPs in which the noun is a word like *imera* (day) or *hronos* (time), the modifier is pre-posed as it is the most salient element in the NP. Common examples are: *ti proti imera* (the first day), *to makro hrono* (the long time), where the concept of time is not the salient part but what is important is the information that the adjective gives. It is really rare to find this kind of meanings realized by one of the other constructions.

N+D+A

This construction can be found in all possible positions in the clause structure (subject, object, predicative complement, NP complement, PP complement).

[31]

<i>anir o kalos</i>	<i>ghini i agathi</i>	<i>dhendhron to hrisoun</i>
man the beautiful	woman the good	tree the golden

According to Mastronarde (1995: 49), this construction is uncommon; we would prefer saying that it is less common than the D+A+N, as it is not really uncommon. Menge (1961) translates this construction as e.g. *anir o kalos* by using the word namely: a man, namely the beautiful one. We cannot argue in favour of this interpretation. The word *namely* is too strong and makes this construction seem similar to *epexegetis*. The indefiniteness of the noun, which bears no article, excludes such a specifying meaning. We could suggest the translation: a man, the beautiful one. The fact that indefiniteness is expressed by the absence of a definite article in AG but by an indefinite article in English makes this translation not faithful enough. Generally it is accepted that there is no obvious semantic differentiation between these two constructions. Indeed, both constructions talk about a referent of a noun with a certain property, as the AdjP has the same syntactic function. However it seems that this construction is more context dependent; Welo (2008) argues that N + D + A can function only as rheme (the focus) of a clause. Many examples confirm his suggestion:

[32]

i) *Sinimi theis, sinimi anthropis ti agathis.*

‘I socialize with gods, I socialize with good men’.

(Xen.Ap.II.1.32)

ii) *Ke dhi legho stadhious ine tous pantas apo thalasis tis Elinikis mehri Souson (...).*

So I say that the total distance from the Greek sea to Sousa(...)

(Hdt. 5.54.1)

D+N+D+A

[33]

o anir o kalos

the man the beautiful

i ghini i agathi

the woman the good

to dhendhron to hrisoun

the tree the golden

This construction is less common than the D + A + N. Again, this construction can be found in all possible positions in the clause structure (subject, object, predicative complement, NP complement, PP complement).

Semantically it is not denoting something different from the two earlier constructions; there is one certain referent. However, it is much more emphatic because of the repetition of the definite article. A possible interpretation (Menge 1961) like e.g. ‘the man, namely the beautiful one’ is not favoured for the above-mentioned reasons. Even though it is mentioned (Smyth 1956: 293) that this construction appears when the referent is previously mentioned, this does not seem to be always the case:

[34]

Dhioikountai e poleis e demokratoumene tis nomis tis kimenis.

Are-managed the cities the democratic the.DAT. laws the.DAT. established.

‘The democratic cities are managed by the established laws.’

(Aesch.I.4)

D+A+D+N

This construction is not found in texts in Attic Greek.

N+A/A+N

[35]

<i>anir kalos</i>	<i>ghini aghathi</i>	<i>dhendhron hrisoun</i>
man beautiful	woman good	tree golden

Grammars tend to comment less on the indefinite constructions. The N+A construction is more common than the A+N one, as it is the default one (Dik 1997). But that does not mean that it is the most common. Again, it depends on the context; if the complex NP does not function contrastively within the clause or in the wider discourse, or if the meaning of the AdjP is not the salient information in the NP, then N+A is used. On the other hand, the A+N is used when there is a clear emphasis on the adjective. These examples can be very enlightening:

[36]

andhres Athinaioi
men Athenians

This is an extremely common allocution to the Athenians, found in many texts. As it is well known whom the speaker is addressing (to Athenians), he uses the unmarked/non-emphatic construction.

[37]

gheneos anir, Eghef, dhedhokise par emi
brave man, Aegeus, you-count for me
'I think you are a brave man, Aegeus'

In contrast here, the braveness of Aegeus is the salient information in the NP. The fact that he is a man is assumed.

5.1.2 AdjP as predicative adjunct

It is said that these are not part of the NP. However, we do include this construction as we are interested in the modifiers of the NP either internal or external.

D+N+A/A+D+N

[38]

i) *o dhikastis dhikeos*
the judge just

ii) *dhikeos o dhikastis*
just the judge

This structure needs first to be clarified. There are many grammars (e.g. Wallace 1996) that this construction as meaning ‘the judge is just’. We argue that we should be really cautious with this construction. The interpretation ‘the judge is just’ is correct only if the construction stands as a clause by itself, which is possible in AG because the copula can be omitted. In these cases the AdjP functions as predicative complement. On the other hand, these constructions can be part of a non-copula clause. In this case, as analyzed in chapter 3, §2, the AdjP functions as a predicative adjunct.

What is really interesting is that the predicative function is related to indefiniteness in Greek; the adjective is usually indefinite and the noun definite. Sometimes the predicative adjunct is adnominal, whereas other times it is in other positions of the clause. We are interested here in its adnominal placement.

In terms of word order, again the default is that the noun precedes the adjective. A+D+N is emphatic and usually expresses contrast to the opposite meaning of the adjective:

ii) *dhikeos* *o dhikastis*
just (not unjust) the judge

Associative adjectives cannot be found in this construction since they cannot occur predicatively.

5.1.3 Coordination

Coordination of many modifiers in attributive position is possible in two ways; with the coordinator *ke* or with asyndeton (with or without commas). However there are some restrictions.

[39]

i) *kalos k aghathos anir*

beautiful and good man

ii) **o aghathos, sofos anir*

the good, wise man

But

i) *Anir kalos k aghathos*

man beautiful and good

ii) *Efori hitona porfiroun, podhiri stolidhoton*

He-was-wearing gown red bright decorated

Thus, when the adjectives are pre-posed, the coordinator cannot be omitted, whereas in the default (non-marked) positions the coordinator is not obligatory.

5.2 Constructions in Modern Greek

5.2.1 AdjP as attributive modifier

D+A+N

The most common construction in MG is the D + A + N. This construction also seems to be the most common in other languages like English, German and French.

[40]

<i>o kalos mathitis</i>	<i>i orea ghineka</i>	<i>to palio monopati</i>
the good student	the beautiful woman	the old path

Here, the adjective functions attributively; the properties *good*, *beautiful* and *old* pertain to *the student*, *the woman* and *the path* respectively. The definite article that precedes the modified NP usually has a specifying use as it denotes e.g. who the specific student among a group of students is.

This construction is the most common as it can be used in several positions in a clause, as the need of a definite article preceding an NP in subject position contributes to the frequent use of this construction:

[41]

- | | |
|--------------------|---|
| i) SUBJECT | <u><i>O kalos mathitis</i></u> <i>pai sto sholio.</i>
The good student goes to school. |
| ii) OBJECT | <i>Idha</i> <u><i>ton iriniko dhiadhiloti</i></u> <i>brosta apo ti vouli.</i>
(I) saw the peaceful protester in front of the parliament. |
| iii) PP COMPLEMENT | <i>Pighene volta me</i> <u><i>ton kako mathiti.</i></u>
Go ride with the bad student.
'Go for a ride with the bad student.' |
| iv) PC | <i>o Yianis ine</i> <u><i>o kalos mathitis.</i></u>
The John is the good student.
'John is the good student.' |
| v) NP COMPLEMENT | <i>I kritiki</i> <u><i>tis neas kavernisis</i></u>
The criticism of the new government |

- In subject position i) the NP can denote two possible meanings. This construction can be used to denote that e.g. *the good student* – a specific student – is going to school at the time that this clause is uttered. On the other hand, this construction can be used with a generalizing or normative meaning: a good student is the one that goes to school.

- In ii), where the head of the construction is in object position as well as in iii), where the construction is a PP Complement, the referent of the head of the NP is specified and attributed by the property the adjective expresses.
- Although we mentioned already that the predicative complement is usually not preceded by a definite article, it is not unlikely, as in iv). However, in this case only the specifying use of *be* is available since the definite article of the NP does not allow an ascriptive use.

The D+A+N construction is the only one used for special cases where the referent of the modified NP expresses uniqueness. The definite article cannot be omitted or replaced by an indefinite article:

[42]

<i>o elinikos laos</i>	<i>o Indhos prothipourghos</i>
the Greek nation	the Indian Prime minister

For these cases the D+A+N construction is obligatory in every position the NP is found in the clause structure.

A+N

[43]

<i>kalos mathitis</i>	<i>orea ghineka</i>	<i>palio monopati</i>
good student	beautiful woman	old path

Here, the property *good* is attributed to the *student*. The lack of the definite article expresses indefiniteness; the referent of the modified noun is not a specific one. In clause structure the A+N construction can take all the functions mentioned in [41] above. However, we exemplify two of these functions of this construction in particular:

[44]

i) PC *O Janis ine kalos mathitis.*

The John is good student.

‘John is a good student’.

ii) SUBJECT

a. *Spoudhei anthropi ghinan ethelontes.*

Great men became volunteers.

b. *Neos andras esose ilikiomeni ghineka.*

Young man saved old woman.

- Predicative Complement. As already mentioned in MG the predicative function is tightly related with indefiniteness realized with the absence of a definite article. In clauses like i) the use of the copula is ascriptive because of the lack of a definite article. The property of a good man is given to John. It is really interesting that in English the respective construction needs an indefinite article.

Huddleston and Pullum (2005: 76) mention that it is possible that the copula can be both ascriptive and specifying. They use the example ‘I thought he was a friend of mine’. By adding a modifier to the NP, we can see an interesting contrast with Modern Greek:

[45]

I thought she was a good friend of mine.

In English this clause could mean that the person talking saw a man who looked similar to a friend of his/her; in that case the copula is specifying. On the other hand, the copula could be used ascriptively, meaning that the person talking refers to a man that is no longer a friend of the speaker. Interestingly, in Modern Greek the fact that indefiniteness can be expressed either by the lack of a definite article or the use of an indefinite article does not allow a case like that. In order to express the specifying use of *be* in the respective example in Modern Greek, the indefinite article should be used whereas in order to express the ascriptive use of *be* no article should be used:

[46]

Nomiza oti itan enas kalos filos mou.

‘I thought he was a good friend of mine’

Here the meaning is that I thought I saw a good friend of mine.

[47]

Nomiza oti itan kalos filos mou.

I thought she was a good friend of mine.

- Subject. In principle, NPs that function as subjects should have an article (definite or indefinite) to be grammatical; this is why the A+D construction is not easily found in Subject position. There are two cases where we find the A+D construction in subject position.

a) In ii) a., where the head noun is in the plural form, the clause is fully grammatical. The meaning of the NP is easily expressed under the term ‘generalizing anaphora’ found in Cleris and Babiniotis (2005).

b) The ii) b is an example of a rare construction. These types of NPs, which function as subject, are found mainly in news articles. Although no article is used, the structure is grammatical as the denotation of this phrase is the same as if an indefinite article was used; the NP young man could be replaced by the phrase *a young man*, without changing its meaning.

Interestingly, exclamative colloquial phrases follow this construction, in order to denote a general situation:

[48]

mistirio praghma!

Weird thing!

‘What a weird thing!’ or ‘How weird!’

spoudhea dhoulia!

Great job!

We can hypothesize that this colloquial phrase used to be a predicative complement to a copula clause like: *Afto ine mistirio praghma!* ‘This is a weird thing’!

D+A+D+N

[49]

o kalos o mathitis

the good the student

i orea i ghineka

the beautiful the woman

to palio to monopati

the old path the path

Even though this construction can be used in several positions in a clause (subject, object, PP complement, PC, NP complement) and it is mainly used in spoken language. This construction has received very little interest in traditional grammars. In contrast it interests many generative grammarians in terms of DP spreading. We will not get to this.

This construction is a colloquial structure semantically close to the D+A+N construction. The property of the adjective is attributed to the referent of the noun while again the use of the definite articles are specifying, denoting who the specific e.g. *student* is. As illustrated in [49] this construction can be used in all positions in the clause structure like the D+A+N construction. However, there are more things that can be said about this construction in both semantics and syntax.

- The definite article that precedes the noun adds emphasis to the specifying meaning, while it is normally accompanied by intonational emphasis on the AdjP. In this case the property of the adjective expresses antithesis as its meaning is opposed to its antonym:

[50]

Idha ton iriniko ton dhiadhiloti

(I) saw the peaceful protester.

Thus, apart from giving a property to the noun, the *property* of the *protester* ‘*peaceful*’ is opposed to the *non- peaceful protester*.

- Kolliakou (2004: 270) illustrates interestingly a comparison between the D+A+N and the D+A+D+N construction.

[51]

i) *o diefthindis dhiLOSE oti i kali erevnites tha eprepe na apolithun.*

'The director declared that the competent researchers should be fired.'

(Two readings.)

ii) *o diefthindis dilose oti i kali i erevnites tha eprepe na apolithun.*

'The director declared that the competent researchers should be fired.'

(Restrictive reading only.)

(Kolliakou 2004:270)

She mentions that in the restrictive reading, which is assigned to both constructions in [51] i) and ii) is the insane reading according to which only the competent researchers should be fired. On the other hand there is the non-restrictive reading which is assigned only to D+A+N construction in i), according to which all researchers should be fired even though they are competent.

- Generative grammarians (e.g. Androutsopoulou 1996: 24) mention that adjectives that cannot be used as predicative complements cannot be used in this construction. Most of the examples they use to exemplify this are realized by associative adjectives:

[52]

*i makedoniki (*i) epithesi enantion ton Person*

the Macedonian the attack against the Persians

‘the Macedonian attack against the Persians’

(Androutsopoulou 1996: 24)

However, we argue that associative adjectives are commonly used in this construction in colloquial speech, specifically in cases where the speaker wants to show contrast to the property another adjective shows (e.g. the Macedonian attack vs the Athenian attack).

- Interestingly, the colloquial word for ‘surname’ in Modern Greek, ‘*epitheto*’, is the same as the word for ‘adjective’. What is more interesting is that this is reflected in a tendency to treat it morphosyntactically as an adjective. The following case will help us explain:

[53]

i) Male's name and surname	ii) Female's name and surname
Nom. <i>o Janis Pliatsikas</i>	<i>i IoannaØ PliatsikaØ</i>
Gen. <i>tou JaniØ PliatsikaØ</i>	<i>tis Ioannas PliatsikaØ</i>
Acc. <i>ton JaniØ PliatsikaØ</i>	<i>tin IoannaØ PliatsikaØ</i>
Voc. <i>- JaniØ PliatsikaØ</i>	<i>- IoannaØ PliatsikaØ</i>

Surnames, as all proper names, are inflected. The genitive form of [53] i) is *tou Pliatsika*. However, women's surnames are not inflected as they are already morphologically in the genitive case; what *Ioanna Pliatsika* really means is:

[54]

i Ioanna tou Pliatsika
the Ioanna of Pliatsikas.GEN. (the father's name)

According to traditional grammars women's surnames are syntactically a *possessive genitive* (see in [12]). A common mistake amongst native speakers of Greek is that they often inflect the female surname by putting an -s suffix on the genitive form as they do with any other female noun or adjective. So, they seem to implement agreement rules as if the surname is functioning as attributive modifier. We can see this also in the fact that name+surname can be used in the construction at hand:

[55]

i Angela i Trousa
the Angela the Trousa

- This construction is also found in some phrases that carries a special meaning which is not easily understood. Huddleston and Pullum (2002: 1416) refer to a construction that “resembles the *it – cleft* but is semantically distinct from it”:

[56]

It is a long lane that has no turning.

(Huddleston and Pullum 2002: 1416)

Example [57] means that ‘a lane that has no turning is a long one’. The respective example in Modern Greek is:

[57]

Ine to makri to monopati pou dhen ehi ghirismo.

Is the long the lane that has no turning

‘It is the long lane that has no turning.’

As in English, the meaning of this construction in Greek is ‘a lane that has no turning is a long one’. So, in this case the use of *be* here despite the use of definite articles is ascriptive and not specifying (Huddleston and Pullum 2002: 1416).

- What is also really interesting is that it is only this construction (and also in D+N+D+A) where examples of non-agreement between the noun and the adjective are found.

[58]

to kapsero o Fanis

the(N) poor(N) the(M) Fanis

In this example the adjective is in the neuter form while the noun is in the masculine form. Thus, the neuter form is used as a diminutive. Respective examples can be found with a feminine noun and a neuter form. This case is found only in animate nouns as gender assignment in proper nouns is completely based on the natural gender of the nouns’ referents. Probably the existence of a definite article in both the adjective phrase and the noun phrase is what allows the gender disagreement of the adjective and the noun.

It is really interesting to notice that associative adjectives (or adjectives in associative use) are normally not used in this construction. We cannot be sure why this is the case.

N+A

[59]

mathitis kalos

student good

ghineka orea

woman beautiful

monopati palio

path old

All the examples in A+N construction [44] above can be used with a different word-order in the NP. That means that the noun can freely precede the adjective. However, N+A is less common. Sometimes this construction gives emphasis to the property the adjective denotes (Mackridge 1985: 292; Cleris and Babinotis 2005; Chatzisavvidis 2009). There is no evidence for an important semantic differentiation between this construction and the A+N.

However, a common use of this construction is associated with the use of many modifiers. Especially in spoken language, it is really common for the speaker to use the noun first and then the adjectives with pauses and/ or a coordinator between the last two:

[60]

Ine epistimonas dhinamikos, dhrastirios ke kenotomos.

Is scientist dynamic active and innovative

‘He is a dynamic, active and innovative scientist’

Cleris and Babinotis (2005: 214) note that associative adjectives are commonly found before the noun. Indeed, the N+A is not normally realized by associative adjectives.

D+N+D+A

[61]

to aghori to kalo

the boy the good

i ghineka i omorfi

the woman the beautiful

to monopati to palio

the path the old

This construction is semantically really similar to the D+A+D+N. The different word order again gives emphasis to the property that the adjective denotes. However, it is not very common. There is no restriction for this construction in terms of the syntactic

function, that is, it can function as subject, object, predicative complement, complement in prepositional phrase. Interestingly, in this construction the AdjP can have, except for the attributive function, the function of parathesis. We will discuss it later.

5.2.2 Constructions in which the AdjP functions as predicative adjunct

As argued in chapter 3, what is called predicative modifier has the same function as the predicative adjunct. Even though the AdjP is not restricted to the adnominal position and it can move fairly freely in the clause structure, we will still comment on the adnominal AdjP that functions as a predicative adjunct. Obviously, in the adnominal position the AdjP is more emphasized than in any other position in the clause.

A+D+N

[62]

<i>hlomos o kathighitis</i>	<i>eftihis I mitera</i>	<i>viasitiko to pedhi</i>
pale the teacher	happy the mother	hasty the child

[63]

- i) SUBJECT *Eftihis o mathitis pai sto sholio.*
Happy the student goes to school.
- ii) OBJECT
 - a. *Foresa yromiko to poukamiso*
I wore the shirt dirty.
 - b. *O servitoros efere proti ti salata.*
The waiter brought the salad first.
- iii) PP COMPLEMENT *Me anihita ta heria mas kalosorisan.*
With the hands open they welcomed us.

This structure can be found in many positions in the clause structure as the head is always preceded by a definite article. In all positions the AdjP modifies the NP expressing mainly manner or time (ii)b).

- Only in some cases where the NP is a PP complement (where the preposition is *me* (with)), it is possible for the AdjP to function as a predicative adjunct when the definite article of the NP is omitted.

[64]

i) *Me anihta ta heria mas kalosorisan.*

With the hands open they welcomed us.

ii) *Me heria anihta mas kalosorisan*

With the hands open they welcomed us.

Because in this construction the property denoted by the adjective is predicated of the NP it modifies, the construction as a whole cannot be used as a predicative complement:

[65]

**I Maria ine eftichis i gyneka.*

The Maria is happy the woman.

In addition, this construction should not be confused with clauses like:

[66]

Ine eftichis i ghineka.

Is happy the woman.

‘The woman is happy.’

Even though the word order seems to be exactly the same as in [62], here the AdjP *eftichis* functions as predicative complement and the NP *i ghineka* is in subject position.

This construction is not as frequent as the previous ones are, as, semantically, the predicative adjunct cannot modify every noun and because there are many adjectives that cannot function as predicative adjunct as they do not express a non-permanent meaning. As mentioned above, less traditional grammars do not comment on this structure at all.

D+N+A

[67]

<i>o kathighitis hlomos</i>	<i>I mitera eftihis</i>	<i>to pedhi viastiko</i>
the teacher pale	the mother happy	the child hasty

Again here, the different word order again gives emphasis to the property that the adjective denotes. This construction is characterized as ungrammatical by some generative grammarians. They mention that the adjective may however appear after the noun for special emphasis; in such cases, if the noun is preceded by a definite article, the definite article must be repeated after the noun. Alexiadou (2001) mentions that for post-nominal adjectives the pre-adjective definite article is obligatory, but does not explain why:

[68]

<i>to vivlio</i>	<i>*(to)</i>	<i>kokkino</i>
the book	the	red

(Alexiadou 2001)

The ungrammaticality of [68], however, is not due to the impossibility of the D+N+A order, but is a result of the fact that in this construction the adjective is used predicatively. Given that the predicative use of an adjective denotes only a temporal property and that the color of a specific book does not change, it is semantically impossible to use this adjective predicatively.

Cleris and Babiniotis (2005: 214) note that adjectives with no definite article when following the noun (surrounded by commas in written language) function as parathesis or epexegesis as the adjective gives more specifying information. They use this example:

[69]

to alogho, gheriko ke kourasmeno, anevene arga tin anifora
'The horse, old and tired, was going slowly up the hill.'

However, it can be argued that because of the indefiniteness of the adjectives it cannot be the case that they function as parathesis or epexegetis as it is neither specified which this *horse* is (epexegetis) nor shown a wider category that the noun *horse* belongs in (parathesis). What [69] really means is ‘*The horse, being old and tired, was going slowly up the hill*’.

Thus, in this construction the AdjP functions not as parathesis or epexegetis but as predicative adjunct (pace Cleris and Babinotis 2005: 214). The fact that the AdjP is detached makes it a supplement (Huddleston and Pullum 2002: 529).

5.2.3 AdjP as parathesis

D+N+D+A

The AdjP in this construction can also be used as parathesis.

[70]

O Yannis o psilos
The John the tall (one)

Traditional grammars analyze the postpositive adjective *psilos* as an attributive modifier to the proper name *Yannis*. Moreover, the adjective here not only gives a stable property to *Yannis* but also specifies which *Yannis* the speaker is referring to. Thus, the adjective in this construction can function as *parathesis*. It is indeed very interesting to observe that the function of the AdjP changes as the word order changes.

N+D+A

[71]

(?) *mathitis o kalos*
student the good

This construction is ungrammatical in all possible positions in the clause structure. Thus the attributive function (as in D+A+N) is not possible. The ungrammaticality can be explained by the fact that it is not possible for an indefinite noun being modified by an adjective with a definite article. The AdjP preceded by a definite article cannot be post nominal to a bare head NP. For example:

[72]

**O Yianis ine mathitis o kalos.*

The John is student the good.

There are however some examples where this construction can be acceptable but only with the use of a comma or a pause; in this case the adjective will function as *parathesis* and not as attributive modifier

[73]

(?)*Aghorasa paputsia, ta kokkina.*

I-bought shoes, the red.

‘I bought shoes, the red ones’

However, this construction is extremely rare.

5.2.4 Multiple modification

In constructions where the adjective precedes the noun the NP can take many modifiers. The modifiers can be either in coordination or not. In the case of coordination it is possible to use a coordinator or comma (intonational pause).

i) Coordinator

The coordinator *ke* (and) can be used for two or more coordinates. The last coordinate is the expanded one, whereas in case of more than two coordinates, commas can be used optionally.

[74]

o trelos, kakos ke dhiestramenos epistimonas
the crazy, bad and corrupted scientist

However it is essential to mention that if both (or all) coordinate adjectives are defined and a coordinator is used, then the noun is referent to more entities. The same is evident in English in examples like *the good the bad and the ugly guy*.

[75]

o trelos ke o kakos epistimonas
the crazy and the bad scientist

The last argument can be tested by using this phrase in a clause and seeing whether there is singular or plural agreement in the verb. Using [74] and [75]:

[74b]

o trelos, kakos ke diestramenos epistimonas troi bananes
the crazy, bad and corrupted scientist eats.(S) bananas

contrasts with:

[75b]

o trelos ke o kakos epistimonas ine fili
the crazy and the bad scientist are.(PL) friends

Moreover it is worth noting that an ascriptive and an associative adjective, both functioning as attributive modifiers in a NP, cannot be coordinated with the use of a coordinator.

[76]

**i kali ke fotoghrafiki mnimi*
the good and photographic memory

Comma (pause)

The use of a comma under the asyndeton reading is obligatory when the adjectives are similar or synonymous (Stavrou 1999: 209). Generally, the comma is used in cases where each adjective modifies separately the noun.

[77]

i kali pisti polites

the good faithful citizens

‘The good, faithful citizens’

For extra emphasis the definite article precedes each adjective (Cleris and Babiniotis 2005: 214):

[78]

to oreo, to monadiko, to peripeteiodes taksidi de tha to ksexasoun pote

the nice, the unique, the adventurous voyage not will it forget ever

‘They will never forget the nice, unique, adventurous voyage’

However, in the D+A+D+N and D+N+D+A constructions, coordination of the modifiers is restricted; in order for this construction to be grammatical, a definite article must precede each adjective and the noun without any coordinator:

[79]

i)* *to oreo ke monadiko to taksidi*

the nice and unique the voyage

ii)* *to oreo, monadiko to taksidi*

the nice, unique the voyage

iii) *to oreo, to monadiko to taksidi*

the nice, the unique the voyage

Interestingly in [79] iii) the definite article of the first modifier can be omitted; of course its syntactic function will change:

[80]

oreo to monadiko taksidi

nice the unique voyage

Here, the adjective *nice* functions predicatively to the NP *unique voyage*. As mentioned above, the only case where a modifier can function predicatively to a noun is where the noun is defined and the adjective is not.

iii) No coordination

The absence of a comma or a coordinator and the word order of the modifiers change the interpretation:

[81]

theoritiki sighthroni ghlossoloji

theoretical contemporary linguists

[82]

Sighthroni theoretiki ghlossoloji

Contemporary theoretical linguists

As Stavrou (1999: 207) notes, in [81] *contemporary linguists* forms a larger set which is restricted by the adjective *theoretical*, whereas in [82] *theoretical linguists* forms a larger set which is restricted by the adjective *contemporary*.

According to Cleris and Babiniotis (2005: 212), in cases where both associative and ascriptive adjectives modify a noun, the associative adjective will be closer to the noun. For example:

[83]

i) *to apesio politiko epihirima*

the horrible political argument

while,

ii) **to politiko apesio epihirima*

the political horrible argument

Here we only considered cases where the AdjP functions as attributive modifier, as in predicative position the AdjP are bare and all this confusion is not apparent.

iv) Special cases

We mentioned above in Chapter 3 that some adjectives are used only predicatively. However, it is also mentioned that e.g. *monos* (alone) changes its meaning when preceded by a definite article (only). In that case, it is used attributively:

[84]

- i) *moni ghineka*
woman alone

but when preceded by a definite article (D+A+N) :

- ii) *i moni ghineka*
the only woman

What is actually more interesting though, is that in the D+A+D+N and D+N+D+A constructions, where the AdjP functions as attributive modifier, this adjective does not have the meaning of ‘only’ but the meaning of ‘alone’.

- ii) *i moni i ghineka*
the alone the women
iii) *i ghineka i moni*
the woman the alone

There is no obvious explanation for this.

5.3 Discussion

The adnominal adjective in Attic and Modern Greek is described in traditional grammars and books (that constitute the tools of both students and teachers in Greece) exactly in the same way:

- the same categorization and terminology is used for both languages (same-case modifiers).
- no thorough explanation is given of the variation found in these constructions (when the variation is mentioned).
- the adnominal adjectives are said to have the same functions in both languages.

However, Attic Greek and Modern Greek are two different languages. The above description of these constructions is not equivalent in these two languages; less information is discussed about Attic Greek than about Modern Greek. Still, with the current observations we can draw some conclusions.

There are elementary differences found concerning these structures which should not be neglected:

- a) The default semantic position of the adjective in AG is to be post-nominal whereas in MG the pre-nominal position is the unmarked one.
- b) Not all constructions are used in both languages. In AG the D+A+D+N construction is ungrammatical, whereas in MG it is completely grammatical. On the other hand, the N+D+A is common in AG, while in MG it is at best of questionable grammaticality.
- c) In MG the adnominal adjective can have more syntactic functions than in AG.
- d) The variation in AG and MG seems to be due to completely different semantic reasons.

We should also not forget that Attic Greek is a dead language. The ancient texts are our only source for Attic Greek; we cannot analyze and interpret Attic Greek in terms of Modern Greek. And vice versa, we cannot analyze Modern Greek based on the established descriptions of Attic Greek.

Chapter 6

Conclusions

There are many different but linked conclusions that are drawn in this analysis. By the presentation of the existing terminology used for syntactic functions realised also by adjectives in Attic and Modern Greek, we suggest that it has to be replaced by terms unrelated to lexical categories. Inaccuracies in the description of functions like the one of nominalization as well as inconsistencies in the organization of the dependents of an NP could be avoided. Furthermore, illustrating the functions the adnominal adjective can have, the data seem to confirm two suggestions. First, the adnominal adjective in Modern Greek can have more functions than already thought. No data were found confirming this about Ancient Greek. Second, the function called predicative modifier found in both languages is practically the same with the function called adverbial predicative complement for which we propose the term predicative adjunct. Systematizing the existence and position of the definite article preceding the head noun and the adjective, we argued that it can determine the function of the adjective. Furthermore, we demonstrated that in some cases the word order of these two elements (AdjP, NP) can determine the function of the AdjP. Using the categorization of ascriptive/associative we proposed that there are links, as also in other languages, between associative adjectives and non-predicative use.

Moreover, the examination of each construction in each language separately suggested that there are reasons for this existence of variation. Thus, we stated that even in constructions where the AdjP has the same syntactic function, it is possible for the construction to be used differently. On the other hand, we presented that the reasons for this constructional variation are not the same for each language – at least according to the data used for this analysis. It is observed that each construction does not share the same status in both languages. This project is an attempt to illustrate that these two languages should be analyzed and described separately especially as they are an essential part of students' education.

Future research on the variation of structures in both languages remains to be done in order to have more information about the use of the structures. On the other hand, the categories of adjectives (ascriptive and associative) can surely be analyzed in more depth in the two languages as an attempt to answer the restrictions on the

associative adjectives, namely their appearance only pre-nominally and their limitation to the attributive function. In addition, the status of these adjectives in the NP structure can be examined: do they function as modifier or complement? Also, the function of the predicative adjunct can be a very fruitful area of research, especially in respect to the cases where this function is realised by an adjective but can be replaced by the respective adverb. Furthermore, the relation of the absence of the definite article to the predicative function, not only in Greek, is extremely interesting to examine. At last, it is really interesting to study where and how this pre and post-nominal construction is apparent in other languages (Romance languages, Old English) and how it affects its syntactic function.

References

- Alexiadou, A. (2001). Adjective syntax and noun raising: word order asymmetries in the DP as the result of adjective distribution. *Studia Linguistica* 55 (3), 217-248.
- Androutsopoulou, A. (1996). The licensing of adjectival modification. In J. Camacho, L. Choueiri & M. Watanabe (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 14th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*. Stanford: CSLI.
- Asonitis, N and Anagnostopoulos, V. (1987). *Syntaktiko tis Archaias Ellinikis Glossas*. Athens: Filologikes ekdoseis Emm. Anastasaki.
- Babiniotis, G. and Kondos, P. (1967). *Syghroni grammatiki tis koinis neas ellinikis*. Athina.
- Bacharakis, M. I. (1995). *Syneirmiko kai leitourgiko syntaktiko tēs archaias Hellēnikēs*. Thessalonikē: Michael Bacharakē kai SIA O.E.
- Baker, M. C. (2003). *Lexical Categories: Verbs, Nouns and Adjectives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bakker, S. J. (2008). On the so-called attributive and predicative position in ancient Greek. Leiden University, the Netherlands. Unpublished paper presented at the American Philological Association Annual Meeting, Chicago.
- Bergson, L. (1960). *Zur Stellung des Adjektives in der älteren griechischen Prosa: die Motive der Voran- bzw. Nachstellung in ihren Hauptzügen*. Stockholm: ALmqvist & Wiksell.
- Billa, P. (2007). *Syntaktiko Arheas Elinikis Ghlosas*. Athina: Organismos Ekdoseon Dhidhaktikon Vivlion.
- Bloomfield, L. (1933). *Language*. New York: Holt.
- Bolinger, D. (1967). Adjectives in English: attribution and predication. *Lingua* 18, 1-34.
- Chatzisavvidis, S and Chatzisavvidou, A. (2009). *Grammatiki Neas Ellinikis Glossas*. Athina: Organismos Ekdoseon Didaktikon Vivlion.
- Cleris, C. and Babiniotis, G. (2005). *Grammatike tis Neas Ellinikis. Domoleitourgiki-Epikinoniaki*. Athina: Ellinika Grammata.

- Dik, H. (1997). Interpreting adjective position in Herodotus. In E. J. Bakker (Ed.), *Grammar as Interpretation: Greek Literature in its Linguistic Contexts*. Leiden-New York-Köln: Brill, pp. 55–76.
- Ferris, C. (1993). *The Meaning of Syntax: a Study in the Adjectives of English*. London: Longman.
- Giegrich, H.J. (2006). Attribution in English and the distinction between phrases and compounds. In P. Rösel (Ed.), *Englisch in Zeit und Raum – English in Time and Space: Forschungsbericht für Klaus Faiss*. Trier: Wissenschaftlicher Verlag Trier, pp. 10-27.
- Holton, D., Mackridge, P. and Philippaki-Warbuton, I. (1997). *Greek: A Comprehensive Grammar of the Modern Language*. Routledge: London.
- Huddleston, R and Pullum, G. K. (1984). *Introduction to the Grammar of English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Huddleston, R. and Pullum, G. K. (2005). *A Student's Introduction to English Grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Huddleston, R. and Pullum, G.K. (2002). *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jespersen, O. (1924). *The Philosophy of Grammar*. London : G. Allen & Unwin, Ltd.
- Joseph, B.D. and Philippaki-Warbuton, I. (1987). *Modern Greek*. London: Croom Helm.
- Kolliakou, D. (2004). Monadic definites and polydefinites: their form meaning and use. *Journal of Linguistics* 40 (2), 263-333.
- Kourmoulis, G. (1964-1965). Morphologhike exelixeis tis ellinikis ghlossis. *Epistimoniki Epetiris tis Filosofikis Sholis tou Panepistimiou Athinon* 15, 9-22.
- Levi, J. (1978). *The Syntax and Semantics of Complex Nominals*. San Francisco & London: Academic Press.
- Lyons, C. (1999). *Definiteness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mackridge, P. (1985). *The Modern Greek Language: a Descriptive Analysis of Standard Modern Greek*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Mastrorade, D. J. (1994). *Introduction to Attic Greek*. London: University of California Press.
- Menge, H. (1961). *Repetitorium der griechischen Syntax*. Munich: Max Hueber Verlag.
- Oikonomou, M. C. (1961). *Grammatiki tis Archeas Elinikis*. Athina: Organismos Ekdoseos Didaktikon Vivlion.
- Oxford English Dictionary Online*, 2nd edition (2000) Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Pullum, G. K. (2009). Lexical categorization in English dictionaries and traditional grammars. *Zeitschrift für Anglistik und Amerikanistik* 57 (3), 255-273.
- Siegel, M. E. A. (1980). *Capturing the Adjective*. New York & London: Garland.
- Smyth, H. W. (1956). *Greek Grammar*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Stavrou, M. (1999). The position and serialization of APs in the DP: Evidence from Greek. In A. Alexiadou, G. Horrocks, and M. Stavrou (Eds.) *Studies in Greek Syntax*. Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Triandafyllides, M. (1941). *Neoeliniki grammatiki (tis dimotikis) [Modern Greek grammar (of common Dimotiki)]*. Athina: Organismos Ekdoseos Sholikon Vivlion.
- Tsolakis, Ch. (2003). *Syntantiko tis Neas Elinikis*. Athina: Organismos Ekdoseon Dhidhaktikon Vivlion.
- Tzermias, P. (1969). *Neugriechische Grammatik: Formenlehre der Volkssprache mit einer Einführung in die Phonetik, die Entstehung und den heutigen Stand des Neugriechischen*. Bern; München: Francke.
- Wallace, D.B. (1996). *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: An exegetical Syntax of the New Testament*. Michigan: Zondervan Publishing House.
- Welo, Eirik. n.d. *Pragmatics of the complex DP in ancient Greek*. Available from <http://folk.uio.no/torgribo/fs/files/welo.pdf>. [Accessed October 4, 2008].